

VIA VERETVTA.

O R

The Truly Safe Way.

DISCOVERING.

The Danger, Crookednes, and Vncertaintie, of
M. Iohn Preston, and Sir Humfrey
Lyndes Vn-Safe Way.

A S S U R E D L Y

*Leading all Christians, to that so blessed, so much
desired, and so much sought for Societie of vi-
sible Professors, continued in all ages from Christ
to vs: no where to be found out of the Church
of Rome.*

I N D I S P R O O F E.

Of *M. Prestons* Catalogue of Protestant Profe-
ssors in the Ages before *Luther*: and of *Sir*
Humfrey Lyndes Arguments and Au-
thorities, brought by him to
the same purpose.



AT S. OMERS,
By *IOHN HEYGHAM*, With Permission,
of Superiors, M. DC. XXXI.



THe impious abhorre them, that ar in
the right WAY. PRO. 29. 27.


The WAY of a foole , is right , in his
owne eyes. PRO. 12. 15.

The foole walking in the WAY (wheras
him selfe is unwise) esteemeth all men
fooles.

God grant vs all true wisdom ,
and grace to finde the true WAY. I
haue no other Epistle Dedicatorie.



TO THE RIGHT WOR-
shipfull, Sir humfrey Lynde.

I.  I R Humfrey, as a Stranger to you, neither knowing you, nor knowen of you, be pleased to know; that as it is an vsuall thing amongst lay Protestants of your profession, no sooner to be in the company of Catholiques, but presently to set vpon them, to ruse, wrangle, and dispute with them about Religion: soe my selfe, amongst the rest of my Catholique bretheren, haue borne no smale part of this-yeksome burthen. For, so virulent, eagre, and hot of the spirit, as those of your side; so ready, so busie, to bibble babble of their English Bible, that being in their company, talking, walking, or sitting at table, though Catholiques nerher begin with them, nor giue them occasion, yet will their glib and slippery tongues, neuerlye still, nor scarcely will they let vs eate one morcell in peace, but we must swallow two or three, (yea sometimes twentie with it) of exorbitant rayling, reuilyng, exclayming, and other vnseemly inuectiue speeches against Popes, Bishops, Doctors, Pastors, Prelats, against

all Religious Orders, and the whole armie of the Catholique Church; She, as the whore of Babilon; he, and they, as the man of sinne; Antechrist, and the diuels eldest sonne. They, and we, as the brats of that wicked brood; All, a company of simple, blind, ignorant, deceiued soules: without the light of the gospel; without the word of the Lord; without the truth; without knowledg, wit, or vnderstanding. All straying, all erring, all out of the way, and knowing nothing besides them selues.

2. How many scores, I haue met with all in my life time of this kinde, what in England, France and Flanders, I shall not neede here to recount. It seemes to be innate vnto them, at least habituall, to hate, rate, reuile and melsprise the whole Church both head and members; yea, my selfe do still remember this itching humor in my selfe when I was a Protestant. Neuer so pratling, neuer so insulting ouer Pope and Papists, as when I knew least, had read least, was most Assè, & most Ignorant in all kind of good knowledg & Christian learning. In so much that this fond frensie grew to such a height in me, that many times I wished I had the Pope him selfe with all his Cardinals hand to hand to combat with me, and (ô Impudencie! ô shameles audacitie!) I assured my selfe, I was able all alone, with my only Bible, to put them all (with all their arguments) into a bagge.) What I then found and felt in my selfe, (to my great grieve be it spoken) I daylie finde
and

and experiment in many, indiscreetly zealous, though otherwise, right honest men of your Protestant profession: who though in their owne conceits, as invincible and unconquerable as any Gyant, yet God knowes, coming to grypes, proue the poorest and weakelt warriors, that may be met with. They will for the presēt hotely say, lay, subscribe, vndertake, aduenture, promise set vpon, and attempt any thing, but giue them a poore position, or only a few of our Catholique lines for a lesson, you shall expect a yeare, two, ten, yea twentie, as I haue somtimes done, and neuer heare further tydings of them.

3. This could I proue and instance in many particulars, and namely in one *M. Lewis*, dwelling nere *S. Marie Oueries*, in London. Who some ten or twelue yeares since, coming to saint Omers, was so importunat to buckle with, and prouoke a Papist, as he would needes presently call for penne and inke, and would constrain me to subscribe; I, to turne Protestant, or he to turne Papist, if with in three months time, at his next returne, he did not quite confound me, and disproue the point we then disputed. Which was; *Whether Protestants were able to shew in euery age from Christ, any visible Professors of their Church, fully and wholie agreeing with them in all points of faith, before Luther, yea, or no?* (The same in substance (sir Humfrey) proposed by the Iesuit vnto you.) He vndertaking the Affirmatiue, I, standing for the Negatiue, we both subsigned, in the pre-

sence of M. Thomas Norwood, and other witnesses.

4. The three months came. M. Lewis also came in person; but no performance of his promise. I urged him to goe to Masse. He requested three months more. I consented, and gave him six. When they were expired (and double their number) at the end of a yeare he came againe, in the company of sundry men and their wives of Douer and Canterburie, who came to S. Omers only of pleasure, to see the Towne. They, and I, going to visit the goodly Churches, Monasteries, and other, monuments of that place, and now and then disputing a point of Religion by the way, I at last premonishing them of what had past betwixt M. Lewis and me, called vpon him in their presence, for performance of his promise, Who answered thus: *I pray M. Heigham, hold your peace: trouble me no more about that point, I am resolved of my Religion.* My selfe smyled at the poore mans answer; The company laughed in their sleeves; he was ashamed of what he had said; and here was the end of this craking Challeng. In which notwithstanding he had confidently, and by name, engaged M. Doctor Vsher, now pretended Lord Primat of Ireland, to be the man, that should reply to that Position.

5. After this, in the yeare, 1628. a new skirmish began betwixt me and M. Harrie Bouth, being both at Calais, invited to supper by one M. Barnard Francua a Flemish marchant, yet living in Calais;

Or, the Truly Safe way.

Calais; where being at table in the company of M. Anthonie Emperor, M. Iean Neue. (some six in all) (all Catholiques, besides himselfe) we were no sooner set, but M. Bouth began to pro- uoke me about Religion; and to come to the point, pressed so far, as that he would needes haue the positiō set downe in writing vnder my hand; obliging him selfe, that the Minister of Markes, (named *Monsieur Bugnet*) should presently reply vnto it. I assented to his demand. Sent it to him the next day in the French tongue as he required; (because he vnderstood no Latin) and in the very tearmes here comprised; The same in substance as the former. *Where was your Church before Luther?*

6. *Iesus Christ, ayant promis de perpetuer son Eglise iusques à la fin du monde, (Matt. 28. 19.) & ce par le moyen d'une succession de Pasteurs legitimes (Ephes. 4. 11.) se demand la confirmation & accomplissement de ceste promesse, verifiée en l'Eglise Reformée continuée d'age en age, separément, & sans interruption, iusques à present. Je dis, les nommes des pasteurs legitimes, tousiours demeurant en la confession d'un & la mesme soy, qu'enseigne l'Eglise Reformée pour au- iourd'huy. A quoy satis'aisant, promet de respondre a quelque autre point (si suis requis) que me sera ob- iecté contre l'Eglise Romaine.*

Iean Heigham.

In English, thus.

Iesus Christ, hauing promised, to perpetuat

his Church to the end of the world, (Marth. 28. 19.) and this by the meanes of a succession of lawfull pastors (Ephes. 4. 11.) I demand the confirmation and accomplishment of this promise, verified in the Reformed Church: continued from age to age, separately, and without interruption, vnto this present. I say, the names of lawfull Pastors, still remayning in the confession of one and the selfe same faith, taught at this day by the Reformed Church. Wherto satisfying, I promise to answer to any other point (being requested) which shall be objected to me against the Church of Rome.

John Heigham.

7. Sending this the next day by *M. Hudson* to *M. Harrie Bouth*, he (as I greatly suspected) hauing imparted the same vnto the Minister, the subtil fishe (a fallen Friar as I haue heard, for a peece of woormans flesh) who knew full well the difficultie of this demand, would in no wile byte of that dangerous bayte. Whereupon he flatly refused the acceptance of that the day after, which him selfe but the day before, had so earnestly vrged to haue vnder my hand, in the prelence of so many persons: and with faithfull promise on the part of his Minister, that he should reply. To be short, *M. Hudson* sent me the position back to *S. Omers*, without so much as a line of *M. Bouthes* to accompanie it a long. The tenor of *M. Hudsons*, was as followeth.

Louing

Loving friend M. Heigham, these are to let you understand, that I went to M. Bouth with the note that you gave me, to deliver to him. He would not receive it, except you would answer to some other questions that he would demand. I promised him that you should answer, to whatsoever he would: and, if that occasion required, you would come to speake with him face to face. He replied, the time served not now to talke of such matters, and so I have sent you the note back againe. This 24. of September 1628.

Thus M. Hudson.

8. Loe what a sorrie shift, and a poore put off, was this of M. Harrie Bouthes? without all cloake, and without all colour of a cleanly excuse? For who sees not, that by the very writing it selfe, I had already obliged my selfe vnder my hande, to answer to any other point that should be objected against the Church of Rome? yet this foolishness, was the chiefest reason of not Replying, and all the reason I could have, for, Where was your Church before Luther? Have a litle patience, sir Humfrey, I goe not far from you, & shall anon come nerer to you. But hauing euer found M. Bouth, a very kind and curteous man in other occasions, vpon the 28. of September following, I saluted him (after a frendly maner) with these few lines.

Louing and kind friend M. Harrie Bouth; I receiued againe the note, as I sent it to you. The guyltie (it seemes) is loth to come to the Bar. The Beare, to the Stake. The Oyle, flies the light. And counterfeits

coyne, cannot endure to come to the Touchstone. I could you then (as also I did the same to M. Louel) that I could neuer yet meete with anyman, Minister, or other, ether in the Kingdome of England, or of France, which euer satisfied pertinently to that proposition, I left you in Writing: and hauing liued in the World, these threescore yeares, am sure to dye, but neuer to see that point resolved, by any Reformed English, or French although my labour in reading hath not bene idle, to see what she learned on ether side haue said thereto. Howsoeuer, leauing to discourse further hereof, and of your breach of promise to me (till our next meeting) although I should liue in the world threescore yeares longer, yet I shall pray there be no breach of loue betwixt vs two, but beseech you to beleeue, that I remaine euer.

Your assured louing friend
and seruant

John Heigham.

9. This combat was no sooner at an end, but a new encounter occurred at my coming to Calais with M. Louel him selfe, so lately mentioned in M. Bouthes letter; who together with M. Andreu Taxley, setting vpon me to dispute, and reasoning about some particular points, at last I reduced the matter to that demand formerly made to Master Bouth. Where was your Church before Luther? To which he replied, that sure they were they had the truth, although they could not allwayes tell where it was in precedent ages. And that they stood

Or, the Truly Safe way.

stood not so much vpon Antiquitie, as they did vpon the pure word. Yet doubted not, but euen to that also, their Minister, *Monsieur Bugnet* could make good answer. I requested him to bea meanes we might speake together; but this he excused with sundry reasons, laying; first, that all such disputes were strictly forbidden by the Kinge, & that the Minister might iustly doubt the deepe displeasure of the *Gouernor*, in case he should attempt to do the contrarie. Secondlie, the like exception might be taken against him, by the Maior and Aldermen of the towne.

10. To this I replied, that I would vnderrake touching *Monsieur de Valencay* (*Gouernor* of the towne, a very Noble gentleman, and of singular zeale in Catholique Religion) to procure vnder his hand, if need were, his permission touching that which should passe betwixt the Minister & me, concerning that point. And for the Maior of the towne, and the rest of his bretheren, if the Minister would come off, I offered to giue in writing for his securitie vnder my hand, this that followeth, to wit. That I had begun, and giuen the occasion of this dispute, and not him selfe, or the Minister. And, if in case any further displeasure should be conceined, or any pecuniarie or corporall punishment, should be imposed vpon the delinquents, that I would pay the one with my purse, and the other with my carcass, to saue both him, and the Minister, harmeles.

11. This round and plaine dealing, somewhat moued

moued the good man : where vpon . forth he went; and, as I imagined, to the Minister. About an houre after returning to me, brought for an answer, a iust *Nihil*, saue only a booke of *M. Thomas Bells*, which he presented to me, telling me, that all Poperie, and Popish argumēt, were there refuted to the full. I replyed, that that booke of *M. Bells*, was long since answered by sundry learned of our side, which he perhaps hauing neuer seene, could not iudge how matters stood betwixt them two : nor was this ought to the purpose to proue to vs ; Where was their Church before *Luther* ? And no maruel, for to send them about this errand, to any man or Minister in the world, is, to send them to seeke a Nedle in a botle of hay, which wlll not be found till domes day. So, after kind leaue taken one of another, and bestowing the wine vpon me, we thus departed for the present : but arriued at home, on the morrow, I saluted him with this short letter.

Gentle Master Louet. Your kind vsage, and curteous entertainment of me being at Calais in your company, hath obliged me, both to thanke you, and to salute you with these few lines ; And further, to present you with a litle booke written against that Bell, whose booke you shewed me. Wherein you shall see what maner of man he was, and of what counterfet myle that Bell was made, which had bin cast and recast, in so sundry mouldes. For first he was a sworne Protestant Minister. Then a sworne Catholique Roman Priest. (Consecrated in Rome it selfe, where he abiured

abjured his former heresies.) And thirdly, became an Apostata and turne-coate Minister againe of his former trade : and so was sworne, and forsworne, iured and periured, three severall times. Would you know the cause of this mans fall? The truth was.

His clapper hit against a womans thigh, Which made that iangling Bell, his faith denie.

I pray you to reade this litle Treatise which I send you, called, the Forcunner of Bels Downe fall, Written by a gentleman whom I knew full well, and was both fellow Student, and made Priest with Bell in the Collidge of Rome, and therefore had reason to know him well. Who hath also learnedly confuted his other works in a far bigger booke, intituled. The doleful Knel, of Thomas Bell : which if you please to read, I will also send you, although in this alone is laid before you, ample prooffe of his lyes and impostures. Thus, as my contryman louing you, and taking a liking to the good nature which I noted in you, I made bould to write thus much vnto you, desiring nothing more then the good of your soule, and next, to re-mayne.

Your euer louing and affectioned friend.

John Heigham.

In the end of the letter, for a Post-script was added this : You shall much oblige me, if I may receiue but two lines in answer from you. Which were nether sent, nor yet receiued, from that day to this; and Luther, with those of the same Religion

gion before him, still left in ~~long~~ *the lurch*.

12. The holy Ghost in the Canticles, *Capt.*
 3. 17. speaking in the person of the Spouse, saith.
Whither is thy beloued gone, o most beautifull of Women? Whither is thy beloued (Lu her) turnd aside?
 Alas, I sought (quoth she) and found him not. The
 people of Israel also sought for Saul, 1. Reg. 10.
 21. but found him not, till consulting our Lord,
 he told them, he was hid at home. Which
 they no sooner heard, but they ran and tooke
 him thence: and he stood in the middes of the people,
 (saith the next) and he was higher then all the peo-
 ple from the shoulders vpwads. whom when they
 saw, they all cried. God saue the King. We haue
 sought this hundred yeares, to find one man of
 the Protestant Religion before Luther, we haue
 sought him, I say, whom the soules of Protestants
 so much loue, but cannot find him. Would God
 they would at last consult with God our Lord,
 that he would reueale vnto them where he lyes
 hid, that so they runing; fetching him forth, and
 setting him in the middes of the market place be-
 fore the Papists, we might cry out with them. God
 saue the only King of Men.

13. But to spare our paines, and not loose our
 labour, the safer way, I suppose, will be, to be-
 leeu the counsell of holy Dauid (Psalm. 36. 10.)
 saying. *And yet a little while, and the sinner shall not
 be: and thou shalt seeke his place and shalt not
 find it.* And afterwards in the same Plalme. *I haue
 scene the impious highly exalted and aduanced as the
 Ceders*

Ceders of Libanus : and I passed by, and behould he was not ; and I sought him, and his place was not found. Iust so is it, twixt vs and Protestants; they highly extoll and aduance their predecessors, as the Ceders of Libanus ; they haue had them euer standing, euer growing, euer flourishing in all ages : they are like *Saul*, higher then any of ours by head and shoulde rs; but when we call to haue a sight of them, here they leaue vs to blow the gossamer, and tel vs plainly we ar not worthy to find, becaule wee seeke not as we ought ; And as *Barlaam* said to Kinge *Iosaphats* tutor (*S. Iohn Damascen. cap 6.* desirous to see that pretious pearle he spoke of, before he shewed it to his Master; to stop his mouth, told him, if ether his sight were weake, or that he were not chaste of bodie, the sight therof would strike him blind : he, deterred therat, said vnto him; marry quoth he, keepe it I pray from my sight, lest I loole my eyes. And this charitie perhaps is in Protestants towards vs, not to shew vs one of their Religion before *Luther*, for feare the sight of such a pearle of so infinit a price, shold with its rare splendor, put out our eyes.

14. This combat was no sooner at an end, but there occurred a far fiercer then any of the former, and that with men of a nother coate and qualitie then the other; caused by an English merchant, named *M. Toby Metharel*. This man (who for his moral honestie I confes I loued much, and therefore had a great desire to do him good) amongst others his weapons where with he vsually

ly defended him selfe, one was this, to contemne all Fathers, all authoritie of Church and councils (at least for this 1000. or 1200. yeares) and to haue recourse to only Scriptures. I will therefore first here let downe what passed betwixt vs two about this point, and then come to that which the same partie occasioned with other persons, about that other vnanswerable (and vn-lucky demand to all Protestants) *Where was your Church before Luthier?* And was this that here ensueth, sent vnto him the 20. of March 1628. vpon a discourse we had together at S. Omers but a few dayes before.

15. Louing friend M. Toby &c. Protestants (and Puritans) in Disputation against Catholiques, haue comonlie recourse to these two houldes; *Only Scripture; With Conference of places.* Other prooffe, or other Iudge ordinarily they admit none. Which recourse of theirs, although it haue bene often canuased, and refuted by Catholiques, as not fully sufficient, yet for the present I will admit it, and endeavour by this kind of prooffe (as it were with weapons of their owne choosing) to encountre, and conuince them.

16. For the present, I will only give an instace in one point, although I could performe and do the like in many more. The question shall be this, *Of the vse of Holy Oyle*: a creature which I find in the word of God, to haue bin vsed vpon sundry occasions. First, by the Patriarks: next by the Prophets: then by the Apostles: and euer since

since the vse therof to haue bene continuated amonghst Roman Catholiques, in their ecclesiasticall Rites and Sacraments: and neuer hath bene, nor is presently in like vse amonghst Protestants: nor no left spark, spot, or print therof, left, or appearing in their Religion.

17. The first passage, which shall be produced, out of that most pure and sacred fountaine, is that (*Gen. 28. 18.*) Where the Patriarch *Iacob*, poured oyle vpon the stone, wheron he had reposed his head, when he beheld from heaven that celestiall vision; promising there to build a Temple, or house, to the honor of God. (*Genes. 31. 13.*) God approving of this fact, and gratefull seruice done vnto him, said vnto his seruant *Iacob*. *I am the God of Bethel, where thou didest anoint the stone, and didest vow, the vow vnto me.*

Gen. 35. 14. He offered thereon to our Lord, liquid offerings, and poured oyle vpon it.

Exodus 30. 25. God him selfe willed *Moyse*, to make the holy Oyle of vnction wherewith to anoint the Tabernacle of testimonie, and all the furniture that pertainned to sundry things, belonging to his holy seruice.

Exodus 40. 9. Taking the oyle of vnction, thou shalt anoint the Tabernacle, with the vessel therof that they may be sanctified; the Altar of holocaust, and all the vessel therof, the lauer with the soote therof; all shalt thou consecrate with the oyle of vnction that they may be most holy. Let these few suffice, fetcht from that first, and most pure fountaine.

18. I will shew next, that the vse of sacred oyle, ceased not when the old law ceased, but was transfered, introduced, and practised also in the new. Let these ensuing passages, serue for a president. First, that of *Marc 6. 13.* *And they (the Apostles) cast out many deuils, and anoynted with oyle many sick, and healed them.*

And *Iames 5. 14.* *Is any sick among you? Let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray ouer him, anoyling him with oyle in the name of our Lord. &c.*

19. Thus much briefly out of these two most pure fountaines of Gods word, for the vse of this creature of holy oyle, besides a number more which might be cited, if it were necessary.

19. Now, that there is any vse, sparke, spot, print, or practise, extant therof amongst Protestants, in any part of their pretended Service or Sacraments, I suppose none amongst them is so shameles, as to say it. How incredible then is their impudencie (or at least ignorance) in pro-uoking vs to dispute with them vpon such grounds as only Scripture, with enumeration and Conference of places, they not being able to produce, so much as one poore place out of any Scripture, old, or new, to proue the vse thereof, ether to be repealed, prohibited, blamed, or reprehended in any person, that duly and orderly vsed the same?

20. Perhaps some Protestants will say; In the Apostles time, the vse of holy oyle was accompanied

panied with miracles : but miracles now ceasing, the vse of holy oyle is to cease also. Wherto I reply; first, that according to our grounds agreed vpon, they are bound to proue out of Scripture, that therefore the vse of holy Oyle is to cease, because miracles cease to accompany the same. Againe, a miracle accompanied our Sauiours Baptisme, the holy Ghost descending from heaven in forme of a Dove : but because we see no such miracle wrought at this day, at any ones Baptisme, therefore to infer, that either Baptisme, or the vse of water in Baptisme, is to cease, were most absurd.

21. I say secondly. That euen this Answer, maketh to their greater shame. For how dare they be so bold, as to banish out of vse, or yet discard this sacred creature, vsed in the Apostles times, and by vse wherof, euen miracles them selues haue bene wrought, by their owne confession?

22. Perhaps they will say, it confers no grace, and therefore may be wholly omitted. Wherto I reply, that the places prealleged, seeme to proue the contrary, intimating, that the things anoyled therewith, were reputed sanctified and holy, by the sole application and touch therof. And, for the persons to whom it was applyed, that they receiued the grace of health: which could not be, if the vse therof conferred no grace.

23. I say further, that though it did not all- wayes confer grace, yet this were not a sufficient ground for any Protestant to discard it. My rea-

Ion is; Prayer, Fasting, and Almes confer not, nor procure alwayes, and to euery one, the grace demanded and pretended by them, and which the vse of the selfe same virtues, haue procured, and conferred to some persons in particular: but therefore to discard them, were most vnchristian.

24. Perhaps they will say the vertu of the blood of Christ is solely sufficient, without the application of such exterior rites. Wherto I reply, that the vertu which we beleue to receiue from sacred Oyle, receiues its vertu from the vertu of the blood of Christ. And if this reason were good, then, may any one deny the vse of Baptisme & Communion, to be needles; because the vertu which they impart to the soules of the Receiuers, doubtles they receiue it also from the blood of Christ.

25. Perhaps they will say, it is only but a Ceremonie, and that therefore it skils not though it be discarded. But to this, as to the former, I still reply, that according to the condicions agreed vpon, they must proue this their saying, by expresse Scripture, that any ceremonie ordayned by God, may be anulled at our pleasure.

26. I say further, that it is more then a ceremonie, and is the very matter, and essentiall, to some of the Sacraments: and euer held and reputed for such by the vniuersall Church.

27. I say lastly, that God him selfe, in sundry places of holy Scripture, straitly encharged and commanded, the keeping of Ceremonies. As

Deut. 4. 8. 14. 45. & Deut. 5. 1. & 6. 1. 17. 20.
 And particularly in *Exodus 30, 22*, he commanded the obseruation of the same, vnder the paine of death it selfe. In the gospel it is also said, that heauen and earth shall passe, but one iot or tittle of the word shall not passe till all be fulfilled (*Mat. 24. 35.*) And else where: he that shall adde or diminish but one tittle to that which is written, I will adde vnto him all the plagues that are written in the booke of life, saith our Lord. (*Apoc. 22. 18.*)

28. Now, is there any Ceremonie, how little soeuer, especially being appointed and commanded by God him selfe, and punctually practised in both lawes; practised in the old, practised in the new, and practised vntil this present thorough the vniuersall Church, that can be reputed so little as a tittle? How then, and with what face, can Protestants vrge vs to dispute with them vpon such tearmes as a forsaide, of *only* Scripture and Conference of places? Or how, or with what face, can they omit the vse & practise of a thing, so clearly deduced, verified, and confirmed by holy Scripture and Conference of places, without most grieuous offence against God, and euident shame and confusion of their Religion? Finally, without incurring those most grieuous penalties, threatned by God him selfe, for so manifest a diminution?

29. This Proposition, was afterwards sent by *M. Metherel*, to *M. Anthonie Larder* in London, by him to be deliuered to *M. Horsham*, and so to be sent to

his old *M. master Preston*, Many, promises weremade of a reply, & assured it should be sent, now by this body, then by that, and namely by *M. Harrie Bouth*, wherof *M. Toby* him selfe shewed me a letter, written to him from *M. Larder*. *M. Bouth* came back to Calais, but no reply at all appeared.

30. At last, almost after two whole yeares, *M. Larder* him selfe came ouer: but the Reply staid still behind. Who coming to *S. Omers*, speaking therof, and of some other points disputed had to hand betwixt vs two (which he also carried away in writing with him, about the erring of the Church, yet I insert not here for breuitie sake) he confest his negligence, that he had not brought an Answer with him, and earnestly praid, that I would but giue him some time anew, to haue the same replied vnto. I exhorted him to engage, nether him selfe, nor his frendes, any further in that affaire; telling him withall in *M. Tobies* presence, that if he promised me to pull a Star out of heauen, and send it to *S. Omers* inclosed in a letter, I would as soone beleeeue he would performe the one, as the other; the one, as also the other, being impossible for any Protestant to performe. The young man, would in no wile be disengaged, nor denyed of his request. Wherefore, to pacifie his importunitie, I gaue consent. But from that time to this, neuer heard further word of my man, saue only that he was sayld in a voyage to Spaine, and had committed the good speed of this Reply, to the two Ministers, *Master Horsbam* and
M. Preston;

M. Preston; To whom M. Horsham, and M. Methrel had bene schollars, and of whom they had learned both Greeke and Latine.

31. By all which may be discerned, what boasters, what crakers, what braggers Protestants be. How forward to offend, how backward to to defend. How prompt to promise, how slow to performe. Having to doe with such simple sots, as Papiſts ar; such Buzzards, so blinde, so ignorant Idiots as they be; without the light, without the truth, without the spirit of the Lord. With all which singular helps and edouments, Protestants being so diuinely endued, yet ar not able to washe their handes of this one argument deduced out of the expresse word, hauing (as they opine) the word of God so wholly for them, and admitting it, and nothing else for the sole Rule of their faith and Religion.

32. But besides this one point of reiecting all authoritie of Church and Councils in matters of controuersie, and adhering only to the written word, M. Toby and I, had many other bickerings, about that insolluble ridle, and so hard to reade; *Where was your Church before Luther?* Vpon this demand, we had often beaten; After this *quere*, we had often enquired; Often times I told him, that this was the knot of knots, that Gordian knot, which neuer Protestant had vntyed. That this was a more easie, profitable, and secure question for men, of common capacitie, as we two were, then any other that could be excogitated, to wind

vp all controuerſies betwixt vs and Proteſtants. For granting vs that we haue the true Church, then grant you conſequently withall we haue the truth. *E contra*, if we grant the ſame to you, then will we grāt you all the reſt, about any other particular point what ſoeuer: for neceſſarily, with the true Church, all truth muſt needes continue. This did I tell him ouer and ouer, not ſo few as twentie times. And further related vnto him in particular, that which had paſſed betwixt *Maſter Lewis*, *M. Harrie Bouth*, *M. Louel*, and other Proteſtants and my ſelfe, about this point, with their inualiditie, and inabilityie to reply.

33. At the laſt, as being ſomewhat ſtudded and troubled with my words, confeſſing he had not ſeene any euident answer to that point in particular, nor was not able himſelfe to answer (this being, as I take it about two yeares ſince) he requeſted me to ſet him briſfly downe in writing, the pithe and ſubſtance of that demand, promiſing to ſend the ſame to ſome learned man in England, to haue an answer. I gladly condeſcended to his requeſt, hoping by Gods aſiſtance, the diſquiſition therof might do him good. The words were not many, but in ſubſtance the ſame that I had giuen before to *M. Bouth* to exhibit to *Monſieur Bugnet*, the French Miniſter, and ordinary preacher in that tongue in the Temple of *Markeſ*; the ſame in ſence giuen by a father of the Societie vnto *Sir Humfrey*, needles therfore to reapeate in this place, otherwiſe then only thus: *Where was*
your

your Church before Luther? Which *M. Toby* receiving at my hands, dilpatched away to his old master, *Master Preston*. Who more directly, & more to the true intention of this demaund, then many other, within a while after, returned an Answer, which I shall set downe word for word, as it lyeth in his letter.

34. No sooner had I receiued this, but instantly I set vpon it, and sent *M. Preston* back an Answer, at two severall times. The first, within fiftene dayes, at the furthest, after the receite of his: and that to the contents of his letter, excluding his Catalogue, resolving then to haue gone no further. Yet not contented herewith, and to giue my good friend *M. Toby*, the greater and fuller satisfaction, within a few dayes after, I sent him the Answer of the whole, euen from one end, to the other: of all which, from that day to this, I neuer heard any further tydings. True it is (as *M. Toby* told me and I beleeeue in him) that he hath wrote vnto them, and put them to it, aboue twentie times, in to much that he was wearie of writing any more about the matter, nor had no hope of hauing any answer, till he went himsele in person. Which he intending many months before he departed, at last he tooke his iorney by me on the first of Iune 1530. whom for loue and kindnesse sake, I accompanied as far as Calais. And there meeting with many of our English merchants of his acquaintance, as by name with *M. Parker*, *M. Andrew Taxeley* (as I remember some halfe

halfe adossen in the whole) we had sundry bick-
erings about religion, especially with *M. Parker*,
whom amongst the whole company, I found to
be the ablest man, and of best and ripest iudgment
to propose, or answer, to such like arguments.

35. To omit a number of things there dispu-
puted *pro*, & *con*, I could them all publicquely, that
nether they, nor all the pack of Protestants put to-
gether, was able to shew, *where their Church was
before Luther?* That Protestants were no men of
reasonable, or faire proceedings with vs in this
point. That this had often bene vrged by vs Ca-
tholiques, and that we could never receiue an
Answer. That my selfe had not only proposed,
but giuen the same in writing to sundry persons
of their side, particularly to *M. Toby*, and to *M.
Daniel Skinner*, both then in that towne, and that
not yesterday, but some yeares since (at least to
one of them) yet neuer receiued satisfaction.
Wherto *M. Parker* replied thus. I would you
would giue me somewhat in writing of that
wherof we two haue disputed, I promise you
faithfully, I would not be so lōg as they, but pro-
cure you soon an answer, or else I would loose my
hand for my labour.

36. The point which *M. Parker* had disputed,
was, about the *Communion vnder one kind*. Wher-
to, being returned home, the sixt of Iune follow-
ing, I wrote vnto him a louing letter, and sent vn-
to him 20. seuerall reasons about that point: such
diligence do we Catholiques vse when we deale
with

with Protestants; but to this present, neuer heard of any answer. The company departed, and in particular, *Master Toby* for England; I, for Saint Omers, at whose returne expecting an answer of my reply from the two Ministers, *Master Preston*, and *M. Horsham* (or at least from one of the) he returned back with a, *non est inuentus*: only could me, that *M. Horsham* was gone downe into Deuonshire to *Master Preston* with my papers, and that himselfe went no further then to London. And thus all this businesse lies in the dust, and we as wise as euer we were, to haue this dilemma solued of Protestants. *Where was your Church before Luther*. Seing therfore in so long a time we can extort nothing from them, be pleased to see (though it be somewhat long) what I sent vnto them, as much, in my iudgment, as would haue prouoked any man to haue replied, that either tendred his owne reputation. or thought it possible to iustifie his professiō. And this it was (with litle difference) in Answer of the aforesaid letter.

M. Prestons letter.

Master Tobie. You haue written to *M. Horsham* and to my selfe, to haue an Answer. I know not what you would haue answered. You should haue set downe some propositions, or doubts, or questions to be answered. I haue seene something which *M. Iohn Heigham* wrote, wherein he taxeth the Minister, for an idle and impertinent application of these words to you *Luc. 4. 62. No man putting his hande to the plough, and looking back, is apt for*

apt for the kingdome of God. The applying of these words to you, ar nether idle nor impertinent. You haue professed our Religion: the Ministers meaning, perhaps was, that you should not shrink, nor goe back. A Christian, hauing taken vpon him, the profession of the Gospell (I meane our Religion, which standes in opposition to Romes doctrine) ought in no wise to goe back from his profession, or to deny his faith, though it cost him his life. The application was good, I pray God giue vs grace to follow it. He spent much time about plowing. He might in few words haue exprest himselfe, and so might you to.

Answer

The manifold vnttruths, and triuffling impertinencies, committed by M. Iohn Preston a Deuenshire Minister; in one sheete of paper, addressed to his friend beyond the seas to disswade him from the Catholique Roman faith: to detain him in the present Protestant or Puritan profession, and to satisfie him about this doubt. Where was your Church before Luther? With an Answer to M. Prestons letter.

1. **L** Ouing friēd M. Toby Methrell, I haue receiued, and read the letter which Master Iohn Preston wrote vnto you, and perceiue he findeth fault that I taxed him (or some other Minister) touching an idle and impertinent application of these words of holy scripture sent vnto you, viz. *No man putting his hand to the plough and looking back*

back is apt for the kingdom of God Luc. 9. 62. M. Preston seemeth to iustifie the application, thus. You haue professed our religion, our gospel &c. Therefore you should not shrink from it, nor goe back. He saith I should haue exprest my selfe, to proue the application to be impertinent. His demand is reasonable, and I will endeavour to satisfie the same. Wherefore, to handle thinges in the better order, I will first touche the application of that place in generall. 2. The word *plough* in particular. 3. Those other of looking back. And then descend to his other points, as he hath digested them in his letter.

1. Reason. I say therefore first. That in points of controuerstiall discourse, that argument is no argument, and that passage of scripture applyed impertinently, which another may as easily retort on me, as I obiekt to him. But this is such an one: ergo idle and impertinent.

That this is such an one thus I proue. Admit I should write thus to M. Preston (as he did to you.) I would not haue you to liue in so dangerous a place. Come home: What shall it profit a man to winne the whole world, and to loose his owne soule? haue a care; for your soules life, is more worth then mony. Take heede; be not seduced: come from Babel; dwell in Sion. A man can hardly touch pitch, but he shall be defiled. Liue in Sodome and Egyp^t, and not be stained and spotted. (and further, ad therto that other passage of the *plough*.) What, I pray, is in all this, which he might not againe retort on me, and say, that to bid him

him come from Babel, I did but bable, and apply those places, both idlie and impertinently, eache one wherof he could as soone apply to me, as I to him?

I say therfore, that all such arguments, are both idle and impertinent. *Idle*, because they may be retorted, as being too generall (for still the question is, whither ours, or theirs, be the *true plough*, wherto euery Chriitian ought to put his hand. Still the question is, whether they or we, be to be blamed *for looking back*.) *Impertinent*, because they conclude not pertinently; as will further appeare by that which followes.

2. *Reason*. I say *secondly*, No part or parcell of holy scripture, applied to detaine a man in heresie, can be applied pertinently. But this parcel of scripture, was so applied. *Ergo* impertinently.

The maior is cleare. The minor also no lesse apparant, by the euident dissentions, & oppositiōs, both by word and writing, which are among Protestants; the English Protestant church, agreeing in all points of faith, with no other Protestant Church in the whole world: nor no other Protestant Church, in all points of faith, agreeing with her. But such renting, tearing, and dissenting. conuinceth them of heresie. *Ergo*, this place was applied to detaine him in heresie.

That the English Protestant church, agreeth with no other externe Protestant Church in the whole world, in points of faith, thus I proue. The French Protestants (for example) acknowledg
not

not
Fren
call
this
Ergo
men
say o
prin
sides

3.
scrip
Cath
this
perti

T
prou
Cath
calles
plied
and i

T
to re
three
sent i
And
senter
for yo
(no n
exami
(not t
notori

not their Catholique Kinge, to be head of the French Church, in all causes, as well ecclesiasticall as ciuill (for so they should be all Papists.) But this is a point of faith with English Protestants. *Ergo*, French Protestants, agree not in all fundamentall points with our English. The like I might say of the Protestant Church of Germanie, two principall Protestant Churches of the world, besides our owne.

3. Reason. I say *thirdly*. No part or parcell of holy scripture, applied to dissuade a man from the Catholique faith, can be applied pertinently. But this place of scripture was so applied. *Ergo* impertinently.

The maior is cleare. The minor also thus I proue. No faith euer was, or can be proued to be Catholique, but only that which is commonly called the Roman faith. But this place was applied to dissuade him from that faith. *Ergo* idle and impertinently.

Touching the word *Plough*, as it is applied to religion, I say, that there are at least ~~two~~ or three seuerall *ploughes*, all ploughing at this present in the English Church after contrary fashions. And that you, to whom *M. Preston* applied that sentence (nor one a great deale wiser) know not for your life, to which of them to put your hand (no nor I feare himselfe neither, were he well examined:) for, do not Protestants and Puritans (not to speake of other pettie sects amongst them) notoriously dissent in important and essentiall pointes

pointes one from another? Know you not, that every spirit that dissolueth Iesus, is not of God? 1. Ioh. 4. 5. 1. Cor. 5. 6. Know you not, that a litle leuen, corrupteth the whole paste? Then heare what a brother or two of his do say, Dang. posit. l. 2. c. 9. 11.

The Protestants prescript forme of prayer and seruice, is all full of corruption. In all the order of their seruice, there is no edification, but confusion: and many thinges in the Communion booke are such, as are contrary and against the Word of God. They put no difference betwixt truth and falsehood: betwixt Christ, and Antechrist: betwixt God, and the diuell.

Another brother of the same brode saith thus. They be all Infidels, that goe to the late Church of England. It shall be easter for Sodome and Gomorrah, in the day of iudgment, then for the court of parliament, by which the Protestant Religion was confirmed. The English congregation, consisteth of all sorts of vncleane spirits, and is no member of Christ. The regiment thereof, is vnlawfull, and Antechristian: their Sacraments, no Sacraments: it is a very Babylon: thus M. Allison art. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. of the perpetuall gouern. of the Church pag. 339. Heare now what others say of them.

The Kinges Maiestie (Iames) speaking of Puritans, in his booke of kingly instructions to his sonne (pag, 41. 42.) saith. Take heede my sonne, to such Puritans, very pests in the Church and common-wealth &c. I protest before the great God, and sith I am here as vpon my testament, it is no place for me to lie in, that you shall neuer finde, With any highland

or border theeues, greater ingratitude and more lies and vile periuries, then with those frantick spirits. &c.

And M. Richard Montagu (as learned a Protestant, as any that hath writ of late) hath in his Appeale to Cesar, quite discarded and cassiered the Puritane, from the Societie of the Protestants. And, with the eare-marke of *bastards* and *vagabonds*, like so many *Irchins*, exiled them from the Protestant Church, and sent them packing to shift for themselves. Epist. ded. pag. 4.

Now, hauing laid before you, these short, but pithie examples, of the seuerall *ploughes* which *plough* vp the earth of the English Church, and how the ploughmen, congratulate one another with their vngodly goades, it is expected that M. Preston step in betwixt them to part the fray, and to appease them: that so the metaphor of the *plough*, may not be said to be idley or impertinently applied by him.

Touching the last word, *looking back*: I say, that England hath not only put its hand, for these 900. yeares last past, only to this *plough* of ours, and not to that of Protestants, till of late since *Luther*: but moreover, they haue *looked backe* from vs, and from our *plough*, not we from them, and theirs. They haue gone out from vs, not we from them: Which, besides that it is a true and euident marke of an heretick (*they went out from vs, but they were not of vs.* 1. Ioh. 2. 19. & 1.4. 1. & 2. Ioh. 1. 7. & Iude 1. 11. & heb. 2 1.) proueth consequently, the application of that passage, to

be both idle and impertinent.

For a close therfore to this one point note, 1. that *M. Presto* hath here three particular arguments, at least, to proue the application of the passage to be impertinent: let him disproue any one of them, if he can: Note 2. that where he invited you to come from *Babel, Sodome*, and the like, other of the bretheren tel you, that to come to Protestants, is to returne to *Babel* and *Sodome*, not to goe from it: Note 3. that where before, this passage was only taxed for an impertinēt application, it is now by his iustification therof, found to be a flat *vntruth*, and therefore must be nocht vp for the first, to begin a greater score. And thus hath *M. Preston* gained as much by disputing this point, as those two did, who accused the innocent *Susanna*: his owne, and his Churches greater confusion. He goes forward thus.

M. Preston.

I gesse this is your request, to know where our Church was before Luther. In these words (besides a Catalogue which he after bringeth) *M. Preston* supposeth, Protestants to haue had a Church before Luther. But this is false, euen by the confession of other Protestants. *Ergo* this is the 2. *vntruth*.

That this is false, euen by the confession of other Protestants (yea, and of *Luther* himselfe) thus I proue. *M. Jewel* in his Apologie of the Church of England: and in his defence of the Apologie, printed anno 1571. pag. 426. nere the end, saith thus. *The truth was vnknown at that time,*

time, and vnheard of, when Martin Luther, and Vlderick Zuinglius, first came to the knowledge and preaching of the gospel. Part. 4. cap. 4. diuis. 2.

Now if the truth were Vnknown and vnheard of at Luthers arising, how is it not false which M. Preston supposeth, to wit, that it was before Luther? If he and Zuinglius the swash buckler, First came vnto the knowledge and preaching of the gospel; then (because nothing can be said to be before that which was first) no knowledge, nor no preaching of that gospel, could possibly be before Luther. If no knowledge, nor preaching thereof before Luther, how wil M. Preston finde a Church before Luther, and not be found in a flat vntruth?

For further prooffe of this point, heare what Master Parkins saith in his exposition vpon the Creede Pag. 406. We say, that before the dayes of Luther, for the space of many hundred yeares, an vniuersall apostacie ouer spred the face of the whole earth, and that our Church was not then visible to the World: thus he. Now if the apostacie from the faith before Luthers dayes, were, for the space of many hundred yeares vniuersall, and that Master Prestons Church was not then visible to the World, how vntrue is it, that he had, or possibly could haue, any Church at all before Luther? especially so conspicuous, and consisting of so many visible martyr members, as he pretendeth in his catalogue?

Nay, I proue this vntruth and idle tale, from Martin Luthers owne mouth, Whose wordes are

these, expresse and plaine. (in loc. com. printed 1584. class. 4. cap. 30. pag. 51. sine. *Tantum causam, in me vnum recipiebam, vt mihi vni sustinendam auxilio diuino iudicabam.* And tom. 1. Wittenberg. printed 1582. in præfat. paulo post med. he saith thus. *Solus primo eram.* And tom. 2. Wittenberg. fol. 63. circa med. *solus tum volebam hoc saxum.* Now I pray request M. Preston, to expound vnto you, the English of these Latin wordes of Martin Luther. *Me vnum. Mihi vni. Solus primo. Solus tum volebam saxum.* and ether the scholler shal take his master in a tripp (for which he confesseth to haue had the whip) or grandsir Luther himselfe, must be proued a lyar. He proceedes and sayes,

M. Preston.

Who profess the Apostolicall faith among vs, before Luther? As though Master Prestons Church and faith, were Apostolicall? And therfore here he suggests vnto his schollar, a third vnruth: which thus I proue.

I confesse it to be one of the greatest (if not the only) glories of any Church, to proue her selfe to be trulie Apostolicall. Herein S. Paul gloried 2. Timoth. 1. 11. saying. *I am appointed a preacher and Apostle, and master of the Gentils.* & 1. Cor. 4. 15. *For in Christ Iesus, by the gospel, I begot you.* And immediately before, *If you haue ten thousand pedagogues in Christ, yet not many fathers.* Now as this indeed, is a singular glorie: so for any Church and faith, to proue it selfe to be truly such, what must she

she do? *First*, she is to name, as *S. Paul* teacheth, hir first Master, Father, and Apostle, him who first *begot her in Christ*. *Secondly*, not only name him, but also proue him to haue bene one, of the twelue (his chaire yet standing) and those descended of him, to be truly and lineally descended, from him, that was first named, to him presently sitting in his place. *Thirdly*, to haue persevered in one and the same true, immutable, and vchangable faith, receiued of hir first Apostle, from thence downeward: This, as I take it, is to be truly Apostolical. But this the Protestant Church and faith, hath not hitherto done nor shewed, nor neuer is able to shew of her selfe; Therefore she is not Apostolicall. But see the particulars further proued.

Not the *first*. For the English Church, hath neuer hitherto named, her first old Master, Father or Apostle, (for I allow not younge *Luther* as coming too late) he who first *begot her in Christ, Iesus*: as we, the English Catholiques do our *Austen*, confest by *M. Preston* in this present letter. Though it please him to say, that he did peruert, not conuert vs English. But why, I pray, did not he as well name vnto you, that old honest Apostolicall Protestant, that did conuert England, as he doth the Monke that did peruert it? Because I wosse, this was to will him, to shew another Sunne or another Moone, then that which hitherto hath bene seene of the whole world; whom therefore the better to conceale from your

knowledge, he in the very last centurie, of this his catalogue hath cautelously hid in the confused heape of no lesse then 1100. Monkes of the Monasterie of Bangor, and yet (as he saith) *not of the popish order*. Which besides that I must needes score it vp for a 4. vntruth, how ridiculous is it to all the world, to heare *M. Preston* prattle of Protestant Monkes? He will soothly, as soone shew you at this present, such a Protestant Monasterie in the middes of England, with 1100. Monkes in it, as name vnto you, the first old English Protestant Apostle. Nay, in only naming Monkes, of so great antiquitie, he proueth against himselfe (though vnwittingly) one point of our religion, but nothing in the world out of those monkes, to make for his.

Not the *second*. For neuer hitherto haue Protestants giuen a list or rolle, of the names of their English Apostolical Bishops or priests, lineally and successiuelly descended from any Apostolical man (his chaire stil exilting) vnto this present: distinct, and *Which standeth in opposition* (marke me wel, for I vse his owne wordes) *to Romes doctrine*; I say Protestant *fully*, and in all points. *Purely*, without admixtiō of any damnable error. *Orderly*, vnder lawfull guides and pastors. *Perpetually*, without the note of manifest chāge. *Clearly*, without collusion, as we haue done the like to Protestants in the *Prudentiall Ballance* for the succession of the pastors of our English Church in particular; and as D. Bristow, D. Norrice and the
answer

answer to M. Whites way hath done, for the pastours of the vniuersall Church, all extant in our English tongue. Nay, he him selfe, who at this present, to satisfie his frend, hath vndertaken this particular taske, performes not the same, but sets him downe quite wearied and out of breath, almost at the halfe way, leauing him to the man in the Moone, to goe looke the rest.

Not the *third*. For their owne chronicles, and acts of parliament, namly of *Henrie 8. anno 31. cap. 14.* make euident mention of one change. That of *Edward 6. anno 1. & 2.* of another. And that of *Elizabeth anno 2.* of a later change in religion, far different from the former. *Ans. to Sir Edw. Cooke pag. 349.*

And thus you see, that I do not only say, as he doth, but also proue, the Protestant Church and faith, nether, to haue named their *first Apostolical Master, Father, or Apostle who begot them in Christ.* Nor any one that hath truly and lineally descended from any such; and consequently ar iust such as Optatus and S. Cyprian speake of, viz: sonnes without a father, and schollars without a master. *Succeeding of no man, begin of them selues.* Nor lastly, to haue perseuered with out innouation, in the same vchangable faith receiued from such their first Apostle: and therfore conclude as before, that M. Preston is conuincied of this *fourth vntruth*, that the Protestant Church is Apostolical.

He proceedes and sayes. *M. Heigham speakes of their Austen the Monke. I might demand of you, Where most*

most of their religion was, as now it is, before the
councell of Trent? It would be a cauil no satisfaction

None at al sir, spare vs not, it shall not displease.
Make the demand when you will, the answer is
returnd, and the difficultie solued long since by D.
Stapleton, who hath fully satisfied the same in his
fortresse of faith; annexed to the historie of the
Church of England by Venerable *Bede*; wherein
he both confronteth, and pertinently proueth, the
entire and ful conformitie, of our present Ca-
tholique religion, with that of *S. Aug.* of a 1000,
yeares standing.

To retort therfore this demãd vpon him selfe.
I demand of him, that he tel you where it was
not before that councel? not only in England,
(which he cannot deny, vnles he deny the sunne
to shine at noone-day) but in any other cittie,
towne or contry in all christendome? If he ether
thinke, wil defend, or by these his present words,
entend the contrary (as it seemes he doth) I must
be bold to score it vp for the 5. *Vntruth*: for so
foule or these mens cause, that hardly shall you
heare them vtter ought against Catholiques, that
ether explicit, or implicite, is not tainted with
some vntruth, as hath hitherto prettely appeared
by *M. Prestons* sheete of paper, and will do more
before we make an end. He sayes next.

M. Preston.

It shal not be amisse to let you see, that their bragges
and boasts of antiquitie of their religion, and the tra-
ducing vs of neweltie, ar very idle.

Surely

Surely, I am both sorrie, and ashamed, to heare a man talke so idly, telling him, *you will let him see*, that which you are neuer able to shew, but rather will shew your owne shame. This I proue from a receiued prouerb, viz. *Vox populi, vox Dei*: which none but one idle, will denie. For if a Papist goe in the street (a Protestant pointing his finger at him, say. *There goes one of the old Religion*) who will suppose the partie so pointed at for other then a Papist? Or is there any so grosse headed a clowne in M. Prestons parish, that will suppose the partie so pointed at, to be a Protestant? Iudge M. Toby, betwixt your old M. and me, who of vs two talke idly?

But not to let him so goe, it shall not be amisse to let you see, that euen Protestants themselues, and those men of no meane account, will disproue M. Preston here, of two vntruths. For the first, Doctor Humfrie tells him. *In Ecclesiam verò &c. What did Gregorie and Aug. bring into the Church? &c. A burden of ceremonies &c. They brought in the Palle for the Archbishop, in celebrating of Masse, and purgatorie &c. They brought in the oblation of the healthfull hoste, and prayer for the dead &c. Reliques &c. Transubstantiation &c. A new consecration of Churches &c. From all which, what other thing is gathered, then that Indulgences, Monachisme, the papacie and all the rest (note this well) confusion of the Popes superstition, was then erected. All which things Aug. the great Monke, and taught by Gregorie a Monke, brought to vs Englishmen: thus this Doctor,*

Hor. Iesuit. par. 2. rat 5. pag. 5. & 627.

Now this being granted, that all the rest of popish superstition was then erected (it being a full 1000. yeares since S. Gregorie and S. Aug.) according to the confession of this Protestant Doctor, where were M. Prestons wits, when he wrote thus vnto you? Are a 1000. yeares with him, no prooffe or argument of antiquitie, especially coming from the mouth of so profest an aduersarie? Let him name any Papist in the world, that gives so honorable a report for the antiquitie of Protestant Religion, and I will promise him, not to score vp this for his 6. vntruth.

For the other vntruth, to wit, our traducing them of nouelty: this also is confest for such by his owne bretheren. And consequently is the 7. vntruth, that we traduce them.

This I proue. First from M. Walter Haddon, who writing against *Oforius*, granteth Protestant Religion to haue bene then but 30. yeares old. In *fine epist. ad Oforium*. Agreeable wherto is the confession of externe Protestants, viz. those of Aufpurge saying. Our confession, is grounded vpon the confession of the Apostles and Prophets, and hath endured these 30. yeares. *Staph. Apol. Anglice pag. 59.* Moreouer, the Apologie of the Church of England pag. 142. Speaking of Luther and Zuinglius, saith. They came first to the knowledge and preaching of the gospell, when as yet the thing was new, and the successe vncertaine. Now I pray, will him to aske the least child in his parish, that can read, what

N E W,

N E W, spels? and as I trow, he will tell him, *new*: this very word, being vled by no meaner a man, then by the Goliath of his new gospell.

But Lord, how could I ouer beare, and presse downe M. *Preston*, with proofes in this kind, but that I may not be too longe? I pray therfore at my request, reade with iudgement, M. *Rogers* preface to the booke of the 39. articles, where speaking of the great desire the Church of England had, to make a draught concerning the summe and substance of Protestā Religion, saith in expres words (pag. 1.) that this was *in these later dayes*. That the first Author herein, was, that holie man (of happie remembrance) *Crammer*. And pag. 2. for so whom better (after God and the Kinge) can we ascribe the glorie of this worthy act. The time; in the daies of that godly young prince, *Edward 6.* That he imparted his thoughts about this point, and consulted particularlie with M. *Caluin*. And pag. 4. he ingeniously confesseth, that the proposing of the 39. articles (containing the whole corps of Protestant Religion) were not diuulged to the world, till the yeare of our Lord 1561.

Now for Gods sake, what is *new*? what is young? what is vplart and of late standing, in matter of Religion, if this be not? who was Bishop *Crammer*? who was *K. Edward*? who was *Q. Elizabeth*, with *Parker*, *Grindal* and the rest, there recited by M. *Rogers*, so few, so new, and so vnfit as some of them were (to wit) the infant child, and the young mayden *Q.* to giue beginning to a
new.

new gospell? There being many yet aliue, who haue beheld in face, the first founders, and old Fathers of this new gospell, how foule an vntruth is it the of M. Preston, that we raduce them of noueltie?

But to shew further, what a Master, your Master is in this euill art, and how he profits from worse to worse, he goes forward and sayes.

M. Preston.

They are but of yesterday. Men could not tell what it was to be a papist, nor what was the bodie of their Religion, before the councell of Trent had defined it: which was since Luthers time.

This indeed, is one in graine, or such a knocker as may stand for twaine, and therefore must needes be natcht vp, at least for his 8. vntruth. For besides that this is already cōfuted by learned Protestants themselves, euen M. Preston confutes himselfe, as will presently appeare. For he makes the doctrine of the Supremacie, a 1000. yeares old. The latin seruice, 940. The Masse 840. The Agnus Dei, 920. The Transubstantiation, 570. The eleuation, and adoration, aboue 401. And are not some of these, of the body of our Religion? How contrary then, is he to himselfe, to say. *They are but of yesterday. Men knew not what it was to be a papist, before the councell of Trent &c.* Fie, fie, thus to make a rod to whip himselfe, and to dispute so slenderly. Hauing hitherto accused vs in generall, he now comes to accuse vs in particular, saying.

Their

Their Papall supremacie, was not hatcht, before the time of Pope goud-face the third. (For so it pleaseth him to scoffe at the supreme Pastour of Godds Church, Pope Boniface, who sate in the Church about a 1000. yeares agoe.)

But now let vs see, if this man in so affirming, haue so honest a face as Pope Boniface had. For learned *M. Cartwright* in his reply part 1. pag. 501. contradicts *M. Preston*. For this Protestant, shewing what soueraignitie Pope *Iulius* (who liued aboue 200. yeares before Pope Boniface) exercised ouer other Churches, saith of him thus. *Iulius Bishop of Rome, at the councell of Antioch, overreached, in claiming the hearing of causes, that did not appertain vnto him.*

Furthermore. Of Pope *Damasus* (who sate in the Church in the same age) thus the same Protestant saith. *He spake in the dragons voice, when he shamed not to write, that the Bishop of Romes sentence, was about al other to be attended for in a Sinod.* Reply part. 1, pag. 502.

Now, sith the authoritie and soueraignitie ouer all other Churches, is that which doth as it were organize and perfect the Popes supremacie, this learned Protestant, confessing the same to haue bene practised, by these two Popes, who liued about 200. yeares before Pope Boniface, how *vntune* is his first instance of our papall supremacie, euen in the iudgement of this Protestant, though otherwise a professed enimie of the same? He goes forward and sayes.

their

M. Preston.

Their Latin service, not before the year 680.

Here first, I would pray you to note, that by his owne confession, he grants it to be 900. yeares old,

Note 2. that in so saying, he contradicts himselfe saying that *men knew not the body of our Religion before the councell of Trent*: for ordinarily Protestants hold this point to be of the body of our Religion, as also that of the supremacie (else why doth M. Preston speake of them?) Now, if he grant it to be 900. yeares old, and to be of the body of our Religion, how maketh he this hange together? It was not *known before the councell of Trent*: and yet was *hatch in the year 680.* vnles by *hatching* the 10. vntruth?

Note 3. That among such infinit diuersitie of tonges and languages, vled as well in the East Church, as in the West, nether M. Preston, nor any other of our learned aduersaries, or any mā living, is able to shew, by good euidence, that the publique service was in the primitiue times, before these late yeares of ours, ether in the Siriac, Arabick, Egiptian, Ethiopian, Persian, Armenian, Scithian, French, Dutch, or English tongue: all which for the more part, vnderstood not the Greek or Latin tongue, more then English men do now. *Ergo*, both the Greeke and Latin service, were in the primitiue times, in a language vnknown

vnknownen to the common people, as Doctor Stapleton hath well obserued against M. Iewell, in his returne of vntruths. Then he sayes.

M. Preston.

The Masse, before Adrian the 1. anno 780.

1. I would haue you here to note, a thing which to me, seemes absurd. For he makes the Latin seruice, a full 100. yeares older then the Masse: for by the Latin seruice, Protestants vsually vnderstand the Masse: so shallow is he, and so vnnskilfull in all he vtters.

Note 2. that he contradicts himselfe in so saying. For I hope he holdes the Masse, to be of the body of our Religion. Now, how brings he these two ends together, with all the cuning in his budget. The Masse, being of the very body of their Religion, was not knownen before the councell of Trent. The Masse is as ancient as Pope Adrian, to wit, aboue 800. yeares old?

3. But now, *ex superabundanti*, to veresie this yet further, heare what Doctor Lusher saith, de abroganda Missa in principio. *Christus hoc Sacramentū instituit, primamque Missam celebrabat.* Christ instituted this Sacrament, and celebrated the first Masse.

Againe, in sermone de nouo Testamento. *Missa enim pars est Euangelij: imò summa & compendium Euangelij.* What say you now Sir to the hatching of the Masse? Not vnder the winges of Adrian the

the 1. (as you calumniat) but vnder the winges of Christ him selfe, as *Luther* confesseth: which plainly conuinceeth you to haue hatched the 10. *Vntruth.*

4. I could bring more proofes to this purpose, in his epistle to those of Smyrna S. Clement martyr epist. 3. both which ancient fathers, vse the very word *Masse*. S. Alexander martyr anno 121. vseth the very word. S. Higinus martir, anno 147. vseth the very word. S. Ambrose anno 390. saith *Missam facere cœpi. I began to say Masse*. lib. 5. epistolarum epist. 33. S. August. who lived anno 425. concione 337. saith *Ecce, post sermonem fit Missa cathecumenis*: with many more which I omit, vsing the very word *Masse*. See you not now (*M. Toby*) how wise your Master shewes himself in opposing *Masse*? He saith next.

M. Preston.

Their Agnus Dei, before Pope Sergius anno 700. To this I answer 1. admit it were not (which yet is false) what hurt is there in this holy prayer?

I say *secondly*, that this is but a Ceremonie in our religion: and that *M. Preston* bewrayes his poeuerie to staine paper with such poore stufte.

I say *thirdly*, that the same came first into their English seruice, in the yeare 1561. (as is already proued out of *M. Rogers* preface) and is at the end of the English Litanies, almost 900. yeares after it had bene in our liturgie..

I say *foursly*, that both S. Chrysostome hom. 41. in ep. 1. Cor. and other ancient authors, make mention

mention of this *Agnus Dei*, though but a Ceremony: and therefore must needs be scored vp for his 12. *Vntruth.*

I lay firstly and confes, That Pope *Sergius* anno 700, ordained *Agnus Dei* to be said in the Masse, this I deny not: but that he first instituted it, or was first Author of it, this I deny. King *James* our late Soueraigne, ordained the saying of the English seruice in the Protestant Church; will *M. Preston* admit this conclusion? Therefore he first instituted it? Let him therefore learne this short lesson, to distinguish, betwixt an *Ordination*, and the first *Institution* of a thing.

By what hath bene said about this pious Ceremony, may be seene how contrary he is vnto him selfe, saying. *Men could not tell what it was to be a Papist, before the Councell of Trent.* Alas, how hath heresie and malice, blinded the man? Next, to touch vs with a point of more importance, he sayes.

M. Preston.

Or their Transubstantiation, before the Councell of Lataran. Which was held anno 1059. vnder pope Nicholas II.

I answer first, that this is false, which thus I proue from *M. Parkins* a learned Protestant: who in his *Probl.* pag. 153. saith thus. *The Ancientes when they speake of the Supper, haue manie formes of speech which shew a Conuersiō. Ambrose vsesh the name of Conuersion, and the name of Mutation. Cyprian saith; It is changed, not in shape, but in nature &c.*

D

Eusebius

Eusebius Emiffenus saith, that the priest by secret power, doth change the visible creatures, into the substance of Christs body and blood. And what, I pray is all this, but Transubstantiation?

I answer secondly, The Protestant Centurists (Cent. 4. fol. 496.) freely confesse. *Chrysostomus Transubstantiationem videtur confirmare.* Chrysostom seemes to confirme Transubstantiation.

I answer thirdly, that *Vrsinas*, another learned Protestant, in his Commonefaction pag. 211. saith. *Theophilactus & Damascenus, plane inclinant ad Transubstantiationem.* Theophilact and Damascē, plainly incline to Transubstantiation.

I answer fourthly, M. Doctor Humfrey (Iesuit. part. 2. rat. 5.) saith. *In Ecclesiam verò quid inuenerunt Gregorius & Augustinus? Inuenerunt &c. Transubstantiationem.* What brought Greg. and Austen. into the Church? They brought Transubstantiation.

I answer fifthly, That M. Preston, in this important point, is evidently contrary to himselfe, for this I am sure he will say to be, of the body of our Religion. Let him then play the cunning Ioyner, and ether ioine these two together, *Men could not tell, what was the body of their Religion before the council of Trent*: and yet grant Transubstantiatiō, to be aboue 500. yeares old: or I must ioine this vntruth vnto the former, and make vp. 12. You may perceiue M. T. how liberally I deale with M. Preston for your sake, that you may see the truth the more plainly, not content to conuince him

ce him by one alone, but by 4. or 5. feueral reasons and authorities. For verely I wonder, with what forehead M. Preston can auerre, Transubstantiation to be but 500. yeares old, considering what is taught to the contrary (not only by the former fathers) but euen by his owne bretheren, who not beleeuing the doctrine it selfe, yet freely (as you see) confesse the great antiquitie therof, but that as I haue often tolde you, false play, is the maine support and pillar of Protestantisme? His last instance, ends thus.

M. Preston.

Their Eleuation and Adoration, before Honorius the third. Most of the Romish Religion is but late inuentions, pieced and patched together by their Popes, at eache of them in their Succession was minded to ad some thing, to make vp the full measure of the mystrie of iniquitie.

To this I answered, first. This Pope liued anno 1216. and so M. Preston who saith that, men knew not what it was to be a Papist, before the council of Trent, and yet alloweth Eleuation for about 400. yeares old, maketh him selfe knowen to the world, for such an one as he was not knowen before: & sheweth you, how hard it is for him to tel so much as one truth; and therefore adds one more to the old score, to make vp fourscore.

I say secondly. That this is not essentiall to religion, but only a pious Ceremonie to stir vp deuotion in the people: To what purpose then doth he produce it?

I say *thirdly*. That protestants them selues teache that in the Sacrament, there ought to be made a commemoration of our Lords passion. But in his passion, his blessed body, was lifted vp vpon the Crosse. Ergo it may be piously lifted vp in the Sacrament, in remembrance of the same passion.

I say *fourthly*. That this most pious practise, was vsed before the dayes of Pope Honorius, as appeareth by the woords of S. Basil lib. de Spiritu sancto cap. 25. *Inuocationis verba dum ostenditur panis Eucharistia, & poculum benedictionis, quis sanctorum nobis scripto reliquit?* Fieri. in Missa pag. 349. Insinuating it to be an Apostolical tradition, practised before any ecclesiasticall writres began to registre their records; which father liued in the 4. age.

I say *fifthly*. That he erres in this, as he did about *Agnus Dei*, not distinguishing betwixt *Ordo*, and *Institution*.

And now to come to his last obiection. Of *Adoration*, which he affirmeth (though most vntruly as of the rest) not to haue bene hatcht before *Honorius* the III.

I Answer *first*. That though I should grant it to be but from *Honorius*, yet stil it should be of about 400. yeares antiquitie, and so proues him as in the former, stil contrary to him selfe: viz that men knew not what it was to be a papist before the council of Trent.

I Answer 2. That S. *Augustin*; who liued with-
in

in 400. yeares of Christ, assures me I may score vp this for his 15. *Vntruth*: who in psal. 98. speaking of this very point saith. *Nemo carnem illam manducauerit, nisi prius adorauerit.* No man eats that flesh, vnles he first adore it. And the selfe same father, in psal 84. saith. *Non solum non peccamus adorando, sed peccamus non adorando:* that is, *We sinne in not adoring.*

I say 3. That it seemes M. Preston belieues not the real presence in the B. Sacrament (which yet their owne Communion booke doth fully warrant in the prayer. *We do not presume* &c. sith he oppugneth adoration. For the one granted, the other may not be denied. But the real presence is clearly and without dispute, granted by Master Richard Montagne in his Ans. to the Gagge vpon this point, as also by sundry other learned Protestants. Therefore by due consequence the Adoration. For if Christ be granted to be there, doubtles he may be adored.

I say 4. That Protestants kneele at the receiving of their owne Communion. But kneeling is an act of adoration. *Ergo.* the Sacrament may be adored.

Thus at last, as we come to an end of his pretended nouelties brought into the Church by Papists, yet none as you see so late as the council of Trent, there being not so much as one point only instanced, which him selfe hath not made, some 900. some 800. some 700. and the very latest of all 400. yeares elder then that council. How vntrue

is it then, to say as he doth? They ar but of yesterday. Men could not tell what it was to be a Papist, nor what was the body of their religion; before the council of Trent had defined it? So that he verifieth the old saying. *Parturiunt montes, & nascitur ridiculus mus.* He promised mountaines, but hath brought forth mole-hills. For of a man which promised so much, neuer in my life, saw I one performe so litle, which hitherto is iust nothing, of all he promised.

After this he whets his weapons, to smite the sacred succession of the Catholike Church, which to all hereticks, is, *castrorum acies ordinata*, and by which, as Irenæus saith, all her aduersaries haue bene confounded. *lib. 3. cap. 3.* His wordes are these.

M. Preston.

The Iewes said to our Sauour. *Thou art not yet fiftie yeares old, and hast thou seene Abraham? Job. 8.* So the Papists say to vs. Your Religion is not yet a hundred yeares old, and can such a Religion be good? The Rhemists say, the other good fellowes (as they tearme vs) cannot for many worlds and ages together, shew that they had any one Bishop, or ordinarie, yea or extraordinarie officer, for vs, and our sect. What certaintie of succession haue they? Ierom maketh Peter the first Bishop; Linus the second; Cletus the third; Clemens the fourth; and all successiuelly. Irenæus. maketh Linus the first; Cletus second. Ruffinus affirmeth, that Linus and Cletus were Bishops, whilst Peter liued: so that the re-
ports

port of their succession, is *Wauering and vncertaine*: thus he. To all which, I answer as followeth.

First, that those two, so old and renowned Fathers *S. Ierome* and *S. Ireneus*, the one making *Peter* the first Bishop of Rome, the other (if we will beleue the Minister vpon his bare word) *Linus*, and from them, as from the first, reckning downwards to the rest, manifesteth, that these venerable Fathers mentioned by himsele, made high account of this golden line and chaine of Succession, deriued from the first Bishop, sitting and ruling in that princelie throane, the prime chaire of the Christian world, else would they neuer (with infinit more who haue done the like) haue so carefully committed to writing, their orderly successings, one to another: wherof *M. Preston* speaketh so contemptuously.

I say secondly. That the mistaking of some one or two particular Doctors about this point, ought not to be of force with *M. Preston*, nor with any other prudent man, to discredit the more vniuersall consent of the same Doctors, who ordinarily recount them thus. First, *Peter*, then *Linus*, next *Cletus*, *Clement* &c. For what succession of Emperors, or almost of Kinges and Princes haue we, wherof writers and historiographers, do not somewhat differ about their raigne? Were it therefore well done to argue thus. *Ergo*, there were no such Emperors nor Kinges at all? For that is indeed the drift of his discourse. Al agree not of the time of Christs passion, for some lay he suffered anno

33. others anno 30. others anno 46. others anno 40. shall this, make the passion it selfe therefore dubious and vncertaine? *Hæreticum quare* pag: 80.

I say thirdly, That if it were granted for true, yet were it no good argument, to proue the nullity of succession, for both the one and the other, may be iustified: for example, *Peter* might be Bishop first, and in his life time, him'elfe of his owne accord, religne that office vnto *Linus*: and so both the sayings of these two graue and Reuerend Fathers, be reconciled.

I say fourthly, that it is false, nor neuer shall he be able to proue out of *Ireneus*, that *Linus* was so by that Father reckned first, as that *S. Peter* nether at one time or other, had not sate before him in that seate. Which because he is so bold to as-firme without further prooffe then his owne bare word, I will be bold to notch vp for his 16. *vn-truth*, till by citing the place, and by good prooffe he shew the contrary.

I say fifthly, that *M. Prestons* supposition is most vnchristian, & of all societies of men in the world, lesse beleeving the mouth of a minister, vnles of one who mēt to bring vs all to absolute atheisme: for of so great necessity is this article, that as *S. Paul* said to the *Corinthians*. 1. Cor. 15. 14. If *Christ* be not risen againe, then vaine is our preaching, vaine also is your faith, and we are found also as false witnesses of God, because we haue giuen testimony against God, that he hath raised vp *Christ*, whom he hath not raised vp, if the dead rise not againe: so say

I to this our new Corinthian, if the succession of the Church be vncertaine, then in vaine hath bene all preaching hitherto, in vaine also is our faith at this present, and the Pastors of the Church, are found also false witnesses of God, because they haue giuen testimonie against God, that he hath left a succession of Pastors in his Church, to continue therein to the end of the world. *Ephes 4.11.* which he hath not done, if the succession thereof be dubious and vncertaine, as this man saith.

I say fixtlie, were it true that our *Succession* were, as Maister *Preston* pretendeth, *Wauering and vncertaine*, he, infringing and weakning the authoritie of ours, in all reason ought to haue produced one more constant and more certaine of his owne, this being the *Glorie* of the new Testament, and of all the priests therof; The *Honor*, which no man may take, but he that is lawfully called therto. *Heb. 5. 4.* The *doore*, by which all true Pastors are to enter. *Iohn. 10. 1.* The *Anchor*, by which the ship of our soule must be held in the storme of heresie. *Heb. 6. 29.* The *Rock*, against which the proud gates of hell cannot preuaile. The *Seede* of Christ, by which he shall possesse his new Sion. *psal. 68. 35. & 24.* from generation to generation. The *royall seat* of his Father David, wherein he shall raigne for euer, and euer in the kingdome of his Church. *Luc. 1.* But this he doth not: He indeed denyeth ours, but sheweth none at all of his owne. If he could effect this, he forceth litle to finde any.

What

What say you now, to this position of *M. Prestons*? Is not he a miserable man, who followeth so blind a guide for his conductor? Who seeketh to shake the very pillars and foundations of the Church, and to make the whole frame (as *Sampson* did) to fall on the heades of all Christians, and quite to kill them? Who endeuoreth to discredit the ancient Fathers, to set them together by the eares, by calling so maine a point of Christian religion into question, yea, that which amongst all others, giueth life and motion to the rest? For the very nature of christianitie is such, that the speciallest externe motiue vnto it, is, the certaine mission of Christ from his Father: of his Apostles from him: *Iohn* 7. 28. *Iohn* 8. 29, *Iohn* 20. 22. of other Pastors successiue from them, from generation to generation to the ending of the world. *Ephes.* 4. 11. *Mat.* 28. This is confirmed, in that the church which is without priests, is, no Church, and none can be a priest, vnles ordained by a Bishop, successor to the Apostolicke priesthood: Which if it be dubious and vncertaine, as this man saith, then farwell saith to all thinges else, and let vs all turne Turkes.

No no, deare frinde, it is not so of Emperors and Kinges, as it is of Priests. For if all the Kings of the earth should faile at once, the people might create a new Kinge. But if all the priests in the world, should faile at once, it is not in the power of all mankind, to make a new priest: none, I say, can do this deed, vnlesse *Iesus-Christ* himself come againe

again in person, to institute a new one. Which supposed, I make this chaine cōsisting of so many inseparable & golden linkes, lets see if M. *Preston* (the true preacher of wauering and vncertaine doctrine) with all his cunning, can vnlinke it, or dissolue it, & let him take M. *Hersham* also for to helpe him.

There is no good, without the chiefeest good: the chiefeest good, is God. God, Iesus Christ, and the Church, are three things fast knit and vnited together. There is no acceſſe to God, but by Iesus Christ. No acceſſe to Iesus Christ, but by the Church. No acceſſe to the Church, but by the Sacraments. No acceſſe to the Sacraments, but by a Priest. None can be a lawfull priest, vnles he be made by a lawfull Bishop. Neuer was there lawfull Bishop made, out of the Catholike Roman Church, wherein the true Apostolike succession is to be found. Therefore this Minister (with all such as he is) are out of the communion of the Church of Iesus Christ, because they haue not a priest of the order of the mediator: which is impossible to haue, seeking for a succession distinct and opposite (as this man will haue it) to that of Rome.

In a word, to draw to an end, and to close vp this point, wheron I haue staid somewhat the longer, because it is of so great importance, I say, that the succession of the Roman Church, from the Apostles times, vnto this present, Protestants can no more deny, then that the same sunne which God created in the beginning

gining of the world, is not the same, but some other sunne created since: no Protestant Church in the whole world, hauing or pretēding to haue, the like succession of Pastors, distinct, and standing in opposition to that of Rome: *ergo* only in her, and no where out of her, is the true Apostolicall succession to be found. If true succession of priesthood be only in her, true doctrine also is only to be found in her, for these, according to our Sauours saying goe together. *Mat. 23. 2.* The principall yea perhaps the sole reason of all hereticks erring from the truth being, because they first seeke to know *what* they should beleeeue, before they knowe, or seeke to know *whom*, they should beleeeue. As D. Champney hath learnedly noted vpon this point, in his Treatise of vocation. pag. &c. I pray God giue *M. Preston* grace, particularly to make his profit of this point.

M. Preston.

The Gentils vpbraided the primitiue Christians with this, *Nunc dogma nobis Christianum noscitur post euolutas mille demum Consules:* so the Papists obiekt to vs. Now at the last, after so many hundred Popes, after so long continuance of the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of Rome, the Protestant Religion is sprung vp. A late Popish Doctor, blusheth not to vtter, that all in England were Papists without exception, from the christening therof, vntill this age of *K. Henrie the eight.* This was an honest Doctor that wrote this. Were

John

John Wickliffes bones burnt because he was a Papist? Our Religion hath bene maintained by godly men before Luther in England, euen in the troublesome and darksome times of Poperie.

Answer.

In this place, he further brings two, or three seuerall obiections against him selfe, in the person of the Papists. The 1. of the Iewes. The 2. of the Gentils. The 3. the words of a certaine Doctor: and about the burning of Wickliffes bones. To al which he answers not so much as one wise word to any purpose, but only saith. *Our religion hath bene maintayned by godly men, before Luther in England, euen in the troublesome and darksome times of poperie.* How poore (alas) and how impertinent an answer to those obiections? And is besides a flat vntruth.

I wil here therefore speake a litle of these two godly men (Wickliffe and Luther) whom Master Preston suppolet to haue bene both of his Protestant Church and Religion, saying of these, and of others, thus. *These professed our religion, and they were of our Church (and a litle lower.) And professed the faith we do.* But this must be examined, for we dare not beleue him vpon his bare word, hauing taken him so often tardy.

1. Of this Wickliffe, Iohn Fox affirmeth sundry thinges 1. That he wrote an epistle to Pope Urban the VI. to haue his doctrine confirmed by him. lib. 1.

2. He

2. He acknowledged him to be. *Summus Christi Vicarius in terris*. Christs cheefe Vicar heere on earth.

3. That if he erred in his doctrine, he should amend it in him, even by his death.

4. He beleued the true instinct of the gospel, to be in him (to wit, the pope) and prayeth they may be preserved in him.

5. Besides these sayings of *Wickliffes* (which I dout much *Master Preston* will litle approue, and lesse follow) he was condemned by the Council of Constance, for 45. heretical articles, collected out of his owne works.

1. Wherof the one was. That Church men might not enioy temporal liuings. No, that not so much as tithes, were due vnto them.

2. That God ought to obey the diuel.

3. That none is a temporal Lord, Prelat, nor Bishop, as long as he is in mortal sinne. Adding, how in that state, a Bishop, or Priest, giues not orders, consecrates not, nor baptiseth.

4. He was indeed (as hee saith) a mortal eni- mie of Monkes and Religious persons, yea, so far forth, that he gaue his verdict of *S. Augustine* and *S. Benedict* by name, that for this alone (vnles they repented) they were damned.

5. That all thinges fell out by absolute necessitie.

6. That oathes, made to confirme humane cō- tracts, were vnlawfull. For all which see *D. Sand. visib. monarch. pag. 533. &c.*

These

These points premised, thus I. argue. *John Wickliffe*, and *John Preston* Minister, were both of one Church, faith and religion, as him selfe confesseth. But *John Wickliffe* allowed the popes supremacie &c. and held all the other articles here recited. Ergo so also doth *John Preston*: else is it false that he is of the same Church, faith, and religion, that *Wickliffe* was of, and must be set vp for his 18. Vntruth.

And now to come to *Luther*, who about the yeare 1517. as *M. Preston* saith, renounced the Pope. But was this enough to proue him a Protestant? Why then, if the diuel renounce the Pope, that should presently make him a Protestat. But let vs heare what *Luther* himselfe sayes; who anno 1518. thus wrote to Pope *Leo* the X. dedicating vnto him, his Disputations.

1. *Quare beatissime Pater, prostratam me pedibus tue beatitudinis offero, cum omnibus quae sum, & habeo. Viuifica, occide, voca, reuoca, approba, reproba. vocem tuam vocem Christi, in te presidentis & loquētis agnoscam.* Sanders visib-monarch.

Wherefore most blessed Father prostrate before the feete of your blessednes, I offer my selfe, with whatsoeuer I am, and haue. Quicken, kill, call, recall, approue, reprove, I will acknowledg your voice, to be the voice of Christ, speaking and presiding in you.

2. In the yeare 1519. he published other resolutions, wherein, he treateth particularly of the popes supremacie; yea, and bringeth six such strōge

argu-

arguments to establish the same, as *Master Preston* with all the wit he hath, is not able to answer. See *D. Sanders* visible Monarchie pag. 576.

3. He taught. There was no sinne but incredulitie, nether can a man damne himselfe, do what mischief he will, vnles he refuse to beleue.

4. The ten commandements, appertaine nothing to vs.

5. It is a false opinion, and to be abolished, that there are foure gospels: allowing only that of *S. Iohn*,

6. If a man be insufficient to lie with his wife, she may with her husbands consent, lie with his brother, or some other man.

7. *E contra*, if the wife will not come, let the maide come: as is to be seene defence of the Censure pag. 51. Will *Mistress Preston*, approue this doctrine, or allow hir maide this euangelicall libertie?

8. He praid to the diuell thus, *Sancte Sathan ora pro nobis: minime quidem contra te peccauimus, clementissime diabole.* In colloq. mensal. fol. 5. 129. cited in the Confut of *M. Rider*, pag. 16. But to stay here, and not to goe much further, as I might, this I argue.

M. Martin Luther, and *M. Iohn Preston* minister, are both of one and the same Church, Faith, and Religion. But *Martin Luther* held, and taught, all these points by me touched. Ergo also doth *M. Iohn Preston*. If he doth not, then is it false that godly *Luther* and he, were of one Religion, and consequently is to be skored vp for the 19. vntruth.

And

And thus much of these two pillars (as Master *Preston* will needes haue them) of Protestanisme, for I will not enter within the enclosure of his ensuing Catalogue (it being the sorriest and absurdest that euer I saw) which if I should, I could proue them euery one such ougly monsters as you haue seene I haue made of these, and no more in all points agreeing with our present Protestants, then M. *Preston* doth with old *Plato*.

And now let me tel you, that this man hath proued all things which he hath said against Papists, with the greatest ease and facilitie, that may be imagined, to wit, by the sole and soueraigne priuiledge and prerogative of his particular pen. Whereby it seemes he knew well, that the art *Negative*, is a great deale easier learned, then the *Affirmative*. For, as they say in schooles, that *Aristotles* Assie may deny, more then *Aristotle* himselfe is able to proue, yet what ill fortune, and how many foule falles he hath receiued, even in the encountre of this kinde, I willingly remit my selfe to your censure, for whose sake and satisfaction, I vndertooke this taske, that you might the better see, on whither side the truth standeth.

But not to leaue him so, nor to let him goe without a new boutte of the same kinde, and to exercise him as well in the *defensiu*e, as *offensiu*e skirmish, I will request to bandy back some balls vnto him, in the Tennis court of his owne triall. Then let him shew me faire play, and follow me from point to point as I haue done him. His owne

wordes shall serue for a proeme to my purpose, and shall expect his answer to the particulars, in as short a time, as I haue dispatcht him this of mine. And now to beginne.

It shall not be amisse to let you see, that their brags and boasts of antiquitie of their Religion, and the tra-
ducing vs of noueltie, are very idle. They are but of yesterday. Men could not tell what it was to be a Protestant, nor what was the body of their Religion, before the Parliament of Queene Elizabeth had defined it. Most of their English Religion, is but late inuentions, peeced and patched together by their Princes, as each of them in their succession, was minded to adde some thinge, to make vp the full measure of the misterie of iniquitie. Thus far word for word, in imitation of M. Preston: now to come to the particulars.

1. Their Regall secular supremacie, was not hatcht before the time of King Henrie the 8. anno 26. of his raigne.

2. Their deprivation of any ecclesiasticall person of his benefice, or excommunication out of the Church, for refusing to sweare against the authoritie of the Bishop of Rome, not before the dayes of the same Kinge, and of his daughter Q. Elizabeth. anno 1561.

3. Their rayling at the Bishop of Rome, calling him Antechrist, not before the dayes of the same Princes. anno 1561.

4. That S. Peter was not Pope of Rome, nor was neuer there, not before the dayes of the same Princes.

5. That

5. That it was an abuse, to offer vp to God the Father, the body of Christ his Sonne, in a reall and gratefull sacrifice vpon an Altar, before anno Eliz. 2. & anno 1561.

6. Their throwing downe of Altars erected to Christ for this purpose, before anno Eliz. 3. & Domini 1561.

7. Their doctrine, that Christ deliuered in his last supper, only a figure or remembrance of his bodie, and not his true and very body, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

8. That there should be no celebration of the Lords supper, vnles there be a good number of communicants with the priest, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

9. That the signe of the Crosse was to be vsed in Baptisme only, and not in the consecrating of the Sacrament of the supper, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

10. That the Communion table, was removed hither and thither, vp and downe, and to be brought into the bodie of the Church, there to distribute the Lords supper, before anno Eliz. 3. & Domini 1561.

11. That the Minister was to rehearse all the ten commandements before communion, and all the people kneeling, to answer after euery commandement. *Lord haue mercy vpon vs, and encline our hearts to keepe this law*, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

12. That the Minister was tied to recite, one

or more of the twentie sentences, set downe in the treatise of the communion, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

13. That a Bishop, being a virgin at the taking of his office, could afterwards conuenably take a wife. And againe, his first wife dying, *tories quoniam*, to take another, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

14. That it was vnlawfull to make the vowes of perpetuall puerrie, chastitie, and obedience, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

15. That it was a godly deed to ouerthrow Monasteries and Nunneries, and turning the Monkes and Nuns out of dores, to allow them to marry, before anno 26. Hērici octauī & Edwardi & Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

16. That it was iniurious to Christ and his mediation, to call for helpe at any others handes, then at his, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

17. That to pray for the soules departed, was repugnant to the scriptures, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

18. That to offer sacrifice, or to giue almes for their soules health, was accounted popish impietie, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

19. That the Sacrament of Cōfirmation (with the other foure denied by Protestants) are meerly the inuentions of men, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

20. That the Images of Christ and his Saints, were to be cut, hewed, defaced, cast out of the Church,

Church, & to be accounted for Idols, before anno Eliz. 2. & Domini 1561.

If ether *M. Preston*, or any man aliue, or all the men aliue, be able to proue any of these articles, by any one cleare or plaine clause or sentence, ether of the scriptures, or of the old Doctors, or any old generall Councell, or by any example of the primitiue church, or by any other, then by manifest condemned Hereticks (quite different from Protestants in many points) from the very dayes of the primitiue Church, vnto the dayes of *Henrie* the 8. and his two children *Edward* and *Elizabeth*, I promise to subscribe vnto him?

This chalége haue I chawked out to *M. Preston*, and shall request, as he will answer it at the day of dreadfull iudgment, not to seeke to seduce your soule, by slandering, or calumniating the Catholique cause, but sincerely, and as a scholler, and good Christian ought, to proceed in all things with truth and candor, calling to mind the counsell of the Apostle: *Propter quod, deponentes mendacium, loquimini veritatem vnusquisque cum proximo suo, quoniam sumus inuicem membra. Ephes. 4. 25.* And that to the Colossians. *Nolite mentiri inuicem. Colos. 3. 9.* Lie not one to another. For it is a hard thing to defend lies, and not to cut ones owne fingers, or contradict himselfe. A hard thing within the compasse of the skinne of one lambe, so to shut vp a whole wolfe, that no part of him be perceiued. One need no more almost, then only reade their owne sayings to catch them in open contradictions,

ditions, whereof you haue seene here a patterne in M. Preston: for commonly it fareth with these men, as it doth with Tinkers, who stopping one hole, make two or three. Here we handle not our owne, but his cause, who is called *via, veritas & vita*, the way, the truth, and the life. Let vs not therfore on nether side, bring any, ether craft or rotten posts, of vntruth, or forgeries, to sustaine his building, which is well able to stand without them.

Truly I was sorry to see in the first part of M. Prestons letter, so many aspersions imposed vpon vs, without any other prooffe then, *ipse dixit*, Wherefore if he please to reply, I desire he play, not vnder, but aboue bord, to wit, fairely and squarely as I do with him, that so we may know where to meete, and to come to trial, if we tax one another of vntruthes, by citing his authors, their bookes, chapters, or pages, for prooffe of what he produceth against vs, and not to admit vs to roue as now he hath done, in the workes of Robin hood. Then shal I hold it also a pleasure, to reply to him. All things will be done to greater edification, where Gods glorie, and the good of soules is sincerely sought: and you your selfe, and every other who shall reade our writings, shal be the better able to accomplish his good counsell. *Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete*: proue al things; hould that which is good. *1. Thes. 5. 21.* Which God for IESVS Christe his sake grant, to him, to you, to me, and to vs all, that
truth

truth found, and all contention once ended, we may all meete together in vnitie of faith in this life, and in vnitie of eternall bleſſe, in the other, Amen.

An after-note, or Catholick caveat?

For as much as it is one of the greatest miſchiefs, and diſorders of our age, for euery pettie and ignorant companion, to wrangle, write, and diſpute of religion, (an office which principally belongs to thoſe who are of the ſacred facultie of Theologie) knowing withall, and freely confeſſinge, my greate inſufficiencie in that ſacred ſcience: therefore, if this reply of myne to *Maſter Preſton*, chance to come to the view of any learned preſt or Catholique Superior (as the dutie of a true Catholique man requireth) I lay it downe meekly, and ſubmiſſiuely at his feete, wholly ſubmitting the ſame, to his, and their, moſt Reuerend, Iudicious, and Prieſtly cenſures, to whom I confeſs, the cognition and diſcuſſion of religion, wholly to belong, and not to me, who am a ſimple and vnlearned lay man. *A beat (hæreticus) confuſus, & edeat confeſſus.* S. Aug. lib. 13. cont. Fauſtum cap. 6.

Hitherto in answer of one part of *M. Preſtons* letter: entending at the firſt (as I ſaid before) to haue entred no further in to the examen and answer therof. Notwith ſtanding, douting afterwards, that bed-rolle of names, diſtinguiſhed by

seuerall Centuries, by making a deceitfull show, might abuse M. Tobies iudgement, I tooke a resolution, for his better satisfaction, to runne thorough the whole, the which I performed within few dayes after, and sent him the same vnto *Esquire*. Having kept the same almost two months in his handes, only to transcribe and copie it out, at length he sent it M. *Horsham*, to be conueyed to M. *Preston*, by the handes of one M. *Vinian*, as him selfe confessed to me. And this it was.

An Examen of Master Iohn Prestons counterfet Catalogue of pretended Protestants: and by him distinguished in to nine seuerall Centuries, from Martin Luther, the married German Friar, to the eleuen hundred Monkes of Bangor, who liued in S. Augustins dayes, the true Apostle of our English nation.

Albeit I haue already most plainly proued against Master Iohn Preston, Protestant Religion, to be granted (and that euen by Protestants them selues) to be but of late standing; to be but newly inuented (euen in the memory of men yet alieue:) to haue beene, a fewe yeares past, but thirtie yeares old, and that by the free and voluntary confession, both of domesticall and forreine opponents, yet further to confound both him, and his like, and to discouer the more palpably, both his, and their false, fond and fraudulent proceeding in this present controuersie, let these ensuing points and aduises be pre-

preconsidered by you, which will giue the better light to the state of the question, and cause you the better, to discouer the truth of this counterfet Catalogue.

1. The first wherof shall be, to consider; that a great number, or in a maner most of the principall propugners and defenders of Protestantisme, in the first birth and swadling cloutes of their new borne and abortiue Church, nether defended them selues, nor her, with no such weapons as these men do now a dayes, but to auoide the danger of so eminent a shipwracke, fled for succour, to the shore and shelter of her Inuisibillity, of her flight into the Wildernes, and of her selfe, into the *harts of faithfull*. Witnes hereof is Master *Jewel*, with a world of other Protestant writers, which I could produce to this purpose, if neede required, and shall be alwayes ready to performe, in case any Colen of theirs, be so hardy, as to auouch the contrary.

2. Secondly, that a great number of learned Catholiques, to confute this their follie, were forced to write sundry volumes of this subiect. Witnes wherof are Doctor *Harding*, Doctor *Stapleton*, Doctor *Sanders*, and sundry others. But had there bene such a perpetuall visible companie of Protestant professors, as Master *Preston* (with other late writers) pretendeth in this his present Catalogue, how false, yea rather how foolish had it bene, for these on the one side to pretend her Inuisibillitie, (some for 1000. some for 1200. some for 1400.

1400. yeares,) as then they did : and how friuolous for the learned on the other, to spend so much time, be at so great expences, and loose so much labour, in opposing such positions ?

3. Hence plainly appeareth, that this sillie and deceitfull deuise, was not yet hatched ; that the egges were not yet laid, from whence this new, prodigious protestant brood, should be produced ; those old Protestants, not being so far gone, nor hauing so quite shaken off all shame, as these young-linges and after commers, since haue done. For their first more honest Protestant forefathers, knowing in their conscience, they had no assured predecessors of their profession, pretended (forsooth) the churches long abode and continuation in molte absurd error, with her vniuersall Inuisibillitie and Apostacie from the faith, for many ages. For redresse and remedy wherof, themselves (like so many vndouted prophets) were sent of God extraordinarily, to preach the gospel, & to restore againe the light and the truth ; which the Pope and the Papists, had quite put out.

4. But these our latter Masters, seeing this sorry shift to be discovered, by the learned Catholiques for most sottish, leauing all the old Protestants, most shamefully in the lurch, and reiecting and exploding their elders arguments, out of their new refined schooles (as fond and friuolous) now forsooth, there is no such matter ; their church neuer hid her head ; neuer fled into the wildernes ; neuer became inuisible, but still in all ages stoutly stood

stood vpon her secte, in despite of the Pope, and of all Papists; which they will, approue and make good (if you will beleeeue their simple promise) by a continued Catalogue, from age to age in euery centurie, euen from *Luther* and *Caluin*, vnto *Christ*.

5. Now, will you know the cause, why these new Masters, haue so soone changed the old songe of their predecessors? Will you see the luttle baite discovered, where with these craftie crouders, thinke they may fishe vnperceinedly, and catch a company of simple soules? forsooth, they haue found by experience, that to pretend their Churches. *Inuisibillitie*, as their more simple predecessors did, was a thinge so poore, and so improbable, that euery child which could but read, might discover the contrary by the scripture. But pretending a Catalogue of Protestant predecessors, in euery age from *Christ* to *Luther* (albeit composed, partly of notorious confessed Papists, partly of notorious condemned Hereticks) who of the common people can discover this? How shal they be able to disproue them in this point? Where will they come to the view of so many old histories, registers, monuments, and ancient records treating of so many mens faith and Religion, written so long since, and liuing in so distinct and different ages as they did, whereby to knowe, what they held with, or against Protestants? Here loe, goes the hare away, here lies al the legerdemaine, and here they thinke themselves Cock-sure.

6. Where

6. Where alas (meane while) who can choose but laugh in his sleeue, to see such instabilitie? such inconstancie? such vncertainie? Where I pray, were your predecessors wits (learned *Isbell*, and his like) that they could not see this starting hole as well as you? Do you not giue the Catholiques by such proceedings, iust occasion to laugh you to scorne? At first (I wosse) your Church was likened to *Elias*, in so much, that euery man, woman, & litle childe, had that sentence at his fingers end, and ready prepared, to stop a Papists mouth with all, enquiring *Where your Church was before Luther*? Then, I wosse, she was fled into the wilderness, and had retyred her selfe only to the hart of the faithfull; was inuisible to the eyes of the world; and only seene and knowen of God himselfe; *Luther* was the first man sent from God, to bring her to light. Now, the case is altered, they haue whole hundreds (at least) of Protestant professors in euery age. What varying? What waue-ring? What flitting? What ficklenes, in a point of such importance? What is this, but to say, and vn say? To play at fast, and loose, like litle children? The Church was hid for many hundred yeares: and she was not. She fled into the wilderness; and she fled not. She was inuisible; and she was not. O ridiculous English ridle, of our ridiculous English Church!

7. But how sorrie, yea how absurd, this new deuised shift is, I shall, God assisting me, shew vnto you. For, as in naturall birth, two, or moe seuerall

all mothers, can not possibly haue both right, to one and the selfe same childe (for that it repugneth vnto nature:) so in this mysticall birth, neuer shall any Protestants be able to proue, that one only and the selfe same mother, can haue right to so many hundreds, yea thousands of children, being of so different spirituall natures. Wherefore, as the wise and worthy *Salomon*, with his diuiding sword, both diuinely and wittily discovered the counterfet mother from the true: so hope I with my blunt sword, in some sort, to doe the like, to this counterfet Catalogue of *M. Prestons*, by assigning each seuerall childe, which I shall examine, to the true, naturall, and proper mother, that first produced it. To accomplish which (as well as I can) I will lay them downe in order, as they are ranked and couched in his Catalogue, such at least as I could come to light of, thorough my smale prouision of bookes, registers and other records of Antiquitie, necessary to examine an argument of this nature.

Centurie 1. of his Protestant Witnesses, from

anno 1417. to 1517.

M After *Prestons* first Protestant witnes is. *William Taylor*, burnd in *Smithfield* for teaching God alone to be praid vnto.

I Answer 1. Touching this first witnes, read *Foxes martyrologe* page 605. col. 1. numb. 12. and you shall finde him to be a flat Papist in all points, except

except in this one of praying to Saints.

I Anf. 2. That in this point nether, did he agree with Protestants, but only dissented somewhat from Catholiques, to wit. *That every petition or prayer, made for any supernaturall gift, ought to be directed to God alone; and not to any creature.* But for any temporall blessing whatsoever, he held it lawfull and behofefull, to pray vnto them: witnes his owne wordes cited by Fox, saying. *Nunquam negavi, aut negare intendo, merita, aut sanctorum suffragia, tam beatorum, quam vianstim.* I neuer denyed, nor intend to deny, the merits or suffrages of the Saints, as well of the blessed in heauen, as those in earth.

Where who seeth not, that although he disagreed from vs in some circumstance of this article, yet that he agreed with vs in the substance of the controuersie against Protestants, and in all other points was a Massing priest? as Fa. Persons in his *Examen*, hath noted vpon this first witnes of M. Preston. How absurd is it then for this one point alone, ether for Iohn Fox, or M. Iohn Preston, to make this man a Protestant martyr; who in this one point, nether agreed with them, nor in no other point in the world disagreed from vs, but was in them all a peremptorie Papist? Are there not 39. Articles required to be beleeued to make a man a perfect Protestant? And can, or shall the beliefe of one alone, suffice the turne, that M. Preston may conclude. *This man was not alone, here was one of our Church, and he profess the faith we do?*

do? This must I therefore needes notch vp for his
20. vntrush.

His 2. Protestant Wines.

1. Lord Cobham, executed for the Sacrament,
by the statute of Loleards.

Ans. To this 2. predecessor of Protestanisme, commonly called by the name of sir Iohn Oldcastle, as Walsingham, Holinsbed, Hooker and Stow, our English antiquaries do write, was drawen and hanged in S. Gileses fieldes, and that for treason against K. Henrie the first, then in France about his warres; molesting a great part of England, with riding, rousing and spoiling, in the Kinges absence, and with great profers of mony, stirred vp the Scots to inuade the kingdome. For which, and for conspiring to murder the Kinge himselve, and his bretheren, he was executed in the place aforesaid. See Stow, anno 5. Henrie the 5. pag. 570.

His wife also, the Lady Eleanor Cobham, Dutchesse of Gloster, together with her chaplaine Roger Onley, were both condemned for the like conspiracie, the Chaplaine of magick; the Dutchesse of witchcraft: as both Holinsbed, Stow, and all other English historiographers do testifie, writing the acts of that yeare. Loe what a pretty paire of Protestants, this married couple were? And what litle grace, redoundeth to M. Preston, to make this graceles man, one of his gospell, or to say he was executed for the Sacrament only, when our owne English writers testifie of him, that he was put to death for flat treason?

But

But here to speake a word or two of him, as he was an Heretique, and to solve what M. Preston saith, that he was executed for the Sacrament by the Statute of Lollards: His opinion was. That in the Sacrament, was contained Christs very body and blood, vnder the similitudes of wine and bread; yea, the same body that was conceived by the holy Ghost, borne of the virgin Marie, done vpon the Crosse, dyed, was buried, and rose againe. For these are Foxes owne wordes of this worthy martyr pag. 512. as I find them cited by F. Persons in his *Examen*. Now, what sence is there for any one to make this man a Protestant, or not rather a plaine Papist, for so plainly approving the reall presence, a point so stifiy opposed (as you shall see anon) by M. Preston?

Lastly touching the statute of Lollards (who liued as Trithemius testifieth, about they yeare 1315.) houlding diuers most damnable opinions, both touching God himselfe, and his Angels, dares M. Preston defend them, or many other mad opinions of this Sir Iohn Oldcastle; in particular, that of his foretelling at his death to Sir Thomas Erpingham (being the last wordes that euer he spoke in this life) of his rising againe the third day? If not, how can he then for shame conclude. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profest the faith we doo without being taxed of the 21. vntruth?*

His 3. protestant Witnes.

William White burned at Norwich vpon the
Kings letter.

Answer.

Well admit he were, let vs heare your learned
inference therupon. Therefore here was our Church,
and he professeth the faith we do. How I pray followes
this? Againē, I might here aske you, whether it
were not for stealing of a White Mare, or a blacke
Sheepe, to the end to teach you to set downe things
of such importance, with more prudence and re-
spect, were I as wilfull, as you shew your selfe wit-
lesse in producing this William.

His 4. Protestant Witnes.

4. Thomas Bagley, burnt in London for Wickliffes
articles.

I answer, that so he should be euen at this pre-
sent, by Protestants themselues, if he were aliue:
which I omit to repeate in this place, because I
haue already done it a little before. What a shame
is it then for M. Preston, to put downe this beg-
garly Bagley in his Catalogue, not daring to name
the opinions themselues, but closely to flubber
them off in silence? Or is he, that euen now seem-
ed to be a Lollard, to soone (Camelion-like) con-
uerted and become a Wickliffist? Shame (I trowe)
will not suffer him yet to conclude. These were not
alone, here was our church, and they profess the faith

We doe: or if he will needes haue them to be his bretheren, then must I needes notch this vp for the 22. vntruth.

His 5. Protestant Witnes.

5. Reinold Peacock, Bishop of Chichester, publicly preached against the Pope, Friars, Transubstantiation, and the whole leuen of Poperie: Was murdered in prison.

I Answer 1. That though this Peacock was not a Papist in these points, yet had he three or four other fethers in his tayle, for which he could not be a Protestant. For, besides other errors which he held, he expressly denied three articles of the Apostles Creed, confest euen by Fox him selfe pag. 652. Was him selfe a popish massing prielt &c. And was not this a pretty Protestant?

I answered 2. Where he saith (to make Catholicks the more odious) that he *was murdered in prison*, it seemeth to be but M. Prestons malice so to imagine; for Fox him selfe, in the very place by me cited, saith. *He was kept in his owne house prisoner, during his naturall life.* So hard a thinge is it for M. Preston to tell the truth. And now to goe vnto his sixt, which is to passe from Reynold Peacock, to Iohn Goose, of whom Master Preston saith thus.

His 6. Protestant Witnes.

6. Iohn Goose, burnd at Tower hill for the truth.

Answer. But nameth not the point in particular: so that ether by these generall words, he may be supposed to be a Papist (for they haue bene

bene burned for the truth) or I know not which of these two *Iohns*, to put downe for the greater *Goose*. Yet will I let the first fly, to pluck a feather with the second.

His 7. Protestant Witness.

7. *Iohn Blunstone*, with many more in *Litchfield*, persecuted for holding against merits, Transubstantiation, shrifte, pilgrimage, pardons, and Latin service.

Answer. These were all of *Wickliffes* cursed crue and opinion, and held as many more points against Protestants, and therefore *M. Preston* can not truly conclude. These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do. Both *Walsingham* and *Stow*, write of these: where you may see more at large that they were such as I report them.

His 8. Protestant Witness.

8. *Richard Huerden*.

Answer. Of this *Richard*, *M. Preston* is so poore that he speakes not a word of him; good nor bad. He names not what religion he was of, but might be a Turke for ought he tells vs to the contrary. The fellow was a poore Wool-winder by this trade: and *Father Parsons* in his Examen, supposeth him to be one of those *Wickliffians* mencioned by *Iohn Stow* anno 1431. pag. 601. Who (saith he) intended to doe many mischiefes under pretence of religious minded men, especially against priests, whose heades they would haue made as cheape as sheepes heades, that is to say, three for a penny.

His 9. Protestant Witnes.

9. Iohn Collet, Deane of Pauls, inueighed bitterly against the inhibition of priests mariages, and diuers other abuses in the popish Church. With many more which for breuity I omit. These were not alone, you must thinke 437. in Lincolne : 68. in London. Here was our Church before Luther, and they profess the same faith we do.

Answer. I should haue much marueled, if I had not found M. Preston, a procter and patrone of Ladie lecherie: for this is proper to sensuall Ministers, first to woo for a steeple, and next for a wenche. I would request him to name, the historiographer, which specifieth ought of the wiues & children of the first Popes and most holy martyrs; as also of those other great fathers and sacred Doctors, *S. Aug. S. Hierom, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, S. Cyril, S. Cyprian* &c. Surely I neuer read nor heard any thinge of the wiues of the first (especially taken after they were priests) nor yet of the she-Metropolitans, or she-Bishops of the second: Whence it appeareth, that priests wiues were rare pearles in those dayes, though now in these they be very common, yea some times, to more then their owne husbands.

I answer secondly, touching those 437. in Lincolne, and those other 68. in London, that they were many of them, of the rebels and conspirators against *Henrie the V.* wherof these 68. were
put

put to death in Saint Gileses fields : witnessed by *Stowes* chronicle pag. 551. These 347. and 68. making in the whole 505. might be set downe for so many *vnttruths*, but say I summe them vp for one, still they make 25.

The end of the first age.

The curtaine being drawen , and *Master Prestons* Protestant witnesses of this first Centurie thus discovered (to wit , 1. *William Taylor* a papist priest and saying Masse. 2. *Lord Cobham*, a traitor and a Lollard 3. *William White*, another priest that said Masse 4. *Thomas Bagley*, a Wickliffian heretick 5. *Reynold Precock*, who denied three articles of the Apostles Cree *Is*. 6. *John Goose* burnt at Tower hil, but he tells not for what. 7. *Iohn Blunstone*, one of the conspirators against *Henrie* the fift. 8. *Richard Houserden*, only put in to stop vp an emptie hole 9. *Iohn Collet*, inueighing bitterly against the inhibition of priests mariages) what a grace is it, thinke you to the new gospell, to be composed of such graceles members? How much at all Protestants bound to *M. Preston*, for packing together this blessed pertigree , wherof he may so confidently say. *These were not alone, here was our Church , and they profess the faith we do ?*

Centurie 2. Of his Protestant witnesses,
from anno 1317. to 1417.

1. **R**oger Winbleton, preached a sermon at Pauls Crosse, against diuers points of poperie, which is yet extant.

I answer, so he might, and yet neuer hold halfe of the 39. Articles of Protestanisme. Therefore to this sermon, it will be time enough to returne an answer, when he tels what the points were.

His second Protestant Witnes.

2. Conradus Gagger, taught twentie four yeares, that the Sacrifice of the Masse was auailable, nether for dead nor quick.

I ans. That this difference of Conrad. Gager, alias Hagger, was but in one point, which could not possibly make him a Protestant, vnles he held al the 39. decreed by act of parliament, of which I dare be bold to say, M. Presto will neuer be able to proue he held nine; Nay Iouinus a Protestant writeth, that he was an obscure persō, and no certaintie of his Protestā Religion. *Lib. rerū memorabilium*. What apparāce is there then, that this man was a Protestant? Or that M. Preston can rightly say. Here was one of our Church, and he professeth the faith we do?

His 3. Protestant Witnes.

3. Gerrard Ridder, condemned Monkes and Friars, wrote a booke against them, intituled, *Lachrima Ecclesie*.

I answer. This againe was but one point which

which therefore could not alone make him a Protestant. And for the point it selfe, so may any good Catholique now, against Monkes and Friars that live amisse, and yet not be accounted a Protestar, but the better Catholique for his paines. Briefly, this was an heretick, who held the wicked opinions of *John Wickliffe*; will, or dares *M. Iohn Preston* approue the same? If not, how thē doth it follow. *Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do,* but by adding the 16. *vntertruth* vnto the former.

His 4. Protestant Wines.

4. *Ploughmans prayer against shrift, Popes curse, Friars, sacrificing priests, single life, canon law, Purgatorie, affirming the pope to be Antechrist.*

I Answer. If he wrote against shrift, then was he contrary to your booke of common Prayer, which in the visitation of the sick, approueth the same. As for the Popes curse, or Ecclesiasticall censure of excommunication, do not Protestants also in fundry cases vse the same, as wel as the pope? And if he opposed single life, thē opposed he *S. Paul* him selfe, who both praiseth and preferreth it before the double. 1. Cor. 7. 38. Lastly, as touching Monkes and Friars, how can *Master Preston* repute this man for his Protestant brother in opposing them, when he him selfe acknowledgeth the 1100. Monkes of *Bangor*, to haue bene Protestants? Therefore, from, this *Ploughman M. Preston* cannot conclude. *Here was one of our Church, and he profess the faith we do,* but by multiplying the 17. *vntertruth*.

His 5. Protestant Witnes.

5. *Armachanus against Friars.*

I Answer, this was but one point only, nor can one point of opposition alone, make a Protestant. Moreover, if he wrote against bad ones to amend them, he was not to be blamed, but to be praised for it. If against good ones, tel vs what he wrote, and then we will tel him more. Meane while, it is a very poore conceit of Master Preston, to suppose that as soone as any are enemies to Monkes or Friars, *ipso facto*, that metamorphosizeth them into perfect Protestants, so that thence alone he may boldly conclude. *Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do?*

I ans. 2. that contrary to Protestants, he allowed all religious orders, but begging Friars. Also, he submitted him selfe to the Pope and his doctrine, to his judgement. Antonin. in 3. part. hist. tit. 29. tit. 7. §. 29. Which I perswade my selfe M. Preston will not do, and therefore must needes be notcht vp for his 28. *vntruth.*

His 6. Protestant Witnes?

6. *Iohn Wickliffe taught bread to remaine in the sacrament. Against supremacie, Monkes, Pardons, the Church of Rome the synagogue of hell, his cleargie heresicks.*

I answer, so he might, as Luther did, houlding withall consubstantiation, whom Master Montagu reiecteth for a Protestant in that very point. As for the point of supremacie, if he wrote against it, how could he be a good Protestant, sith Protestants

testants grant and allow the same in the temporall prince, which *M. Preston* will neuer be able to shew, that *Wickliffe* approved and therefore is proued to haue tould the 29. *Vntruth*. Lastly, this wicked fellow, beside many other wicked opinions already related of him, allowed no lesse then five Sacraments. So many therefore must *M. Preston* allow, or else I cannot allow him to conclude. *Here Was our Church, and they profest the faith We do.*

His 7. and 8. Protestant Witnes.

7. *Bright*, called the pope murtherer, and worse then *Lucifer*; He reprobued the cleargie sharply.

8. *Walther Brute*, held the pope to be Antechrist.

I Answer, these two last witnesses may be answered both in one, because nothing is said of their Protestant profession, saue only that they rayled exorbitantly against the pope, and cleargie But this, of Rayling, being not yet admitted for one of the 39. articles, cannot suffice to make these two British fellowes, perfect Protestants for their excelling in this point alone, nor giue *M. Preston* iust occasion to conclude. *Here Was our Church, and they profest the faith We doe.*

His 9. Protestant Witnes.

9. *William Sautree*, was the first, that was burnt in England for the Sacrament.

I answere, this *William*, was burnt in Henrie the 4. his dayes, anno 1400. for foure or five particular foolish articles, to be seene in *Iohn Fox*

pag. 474. such as *M. Preston* himselfe will be ashamed to affirme. Againe, the man, being but one. The article but one, how can *M. Preston* conclude *William* to be a Protestant? Or are the 39. English articles, now reduced to one alone? Or can he for this one article alone, say of this fellow and say trulie, that *he was of his Church, and profess the faith that Protestants do?*

The end of the 2. age.

To summe vp this 2. Centurie, I would pray you note, that where as *M. Preston* produceth nine witnesses for this age to proue the practise of Protestant profession, *Roger Wimbleton, Bright, and Brute*, haue nothing in particular, saue only most bitter rayling against the Pope; *Contradus Gagger*, against the Masse, *Gerrard Rider*, and *Armachanus*, against Monkes and Friars, with whom *Ploughman* and *Wickliffe* ar partakers, as also in virulent rayling against the Pope. And only *Wickliffe* and *Saurree*, touching the Sacrament, aichough not specifying their particular opinions therein, ether how they disagreed from vs, or agreed with them. Which points, being so few in number, and the witnesses so few (if you take away the raylers against the Pope and Religious perions) how poore is *M. Preston* in prooffe of his Religion for this age? And consequently as one would thinke, hath litle cause to cracke. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.*

Centuria

Centurie 3. Of his Protestant Witneses from
anno 1217. to 1317.

1. **R**obert Grosted Eishop of Lincolne, wrote a-
gainst the Pope and Friars.

I answer, that this was a learned Catholique Bishop of ours, who neuer held any point of Protestāt Religion, and yet is brought in here by M. Preston, as a man of his Church & beliefe, with the greatest falshood and foolerie in the world: and this forsooth, because in some place of his workes, he reprehended the maners of Rome, or liues of some Popes in those dayes. Iust as good an argument, as if a man would proue, that S. Paul was not of the faith or Religion of the Corinthians, for that he sharply reprehended them, for the foule abuses vled amongst them. This therefore being so foule an vntruth, must needes be notched vp for the 30.

His 2. Protestant Witnes.

2. Peter the sonne of Cassiodore, wrote a zealous epistle to the Church of England, deborting it from the tirannie of the Church of Rome.

His 3. Protestant Witnes.

3. The Popes inhibition, Was despised in England
anno 1299.

Answer. These two testimonies, may be answered both in one, as sauoring of nothing else, but of splene and malice against the Pope, and Church of Rome; and is already answered in the
reply

reply to *Bright and Brute*, besides that which hath bene said in the last example of the Bishop of Lincolne: to which I referre you.

His 4. Protestant Witnes.

4. *Diuers about this time, here in England, were accused for adhering to the opinion of the Waldenses.*

Answer. Wel, grant they were, what concludeth he thereupon? *Ergo, here was our Church, and they profest the faith we do?* A mad conclusion as euer man heard! For so it would follow, that what damnable hereticks soeuer were accused by Papists, that accusation *ipso facto*, should make them Protestants.

But because in the two precedent centuries, *M. Preston* patronised, first the *Lollards*, then the *Wickliffians*, I would now know if he will doe the like for the *Waldenses*? If yea, then must he likewise patronise these their opinions, where of the first shalbe.

1. They held Masse, and the consecration of Christs body, by the words of the priest.

2. Four Sacraments.

3. The lawfulness of all religious ordes, except only of such as begged.

4. Free will, and the merit of good workes, in the same sence that Catholicks do.

5. That all carnal lust is lawfull, when lust doth burne vs.

6. That the Creed of the Apostles is quite to be contemned.

7. That the power of cōsecrating, and hearing
con-

confessions, was left by Christ, not only to priests, but also to lay men, if they be iust.

8. That no priests must haue any liuings at all, but must liue on almes (a sore pinche for *Master Preston.*)

These with fundry other, were the absurd opinions of the *Waldenses*, as may be seene in *Prætorius*, and other Authors that wrote of them. Now who would euer haue beleueed that *M. Preston* had bene of these mens mindes, had not himselfe assured vs so, saying. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do!* Or if he recall what he hath said, then must I score vp this for the 31. *vntruth.*

The end of the 3. age.

Lastly to summe this centurie (which as you see is very short) he hath produced for witnesses of his Protestant profession, but only foure testimonies in the whole. Whereof the first being in all points a Catholique, and in none a Protestant. The second, and third, handling no point of Religion in particular, but only in generall, their spleene and malice against the Pope. The fourth and last, that of the *Waldenses*, whose opinions were so shamefull, that euen hee him selfe for very shame, was forced to silence them, what a shame is it for *M. Preston* thus to conclude. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do?* The *Albigenses* being censured Hereticks by Cooper Bishop of Winchester. Al

one with the Waldéses as is thought. See Guide of faith. pag. 107.

*Centurie 4. Of his Protestant Witneses, from
anno 1117. to 1217.*

1. **G**erardus and Dulcinus, preached against the Church of Rome, that prayer was not more holy in one place then in another. 2. That the Pope was Antechrist. 3. Rome, the very Whore of Babilon. They had many followers: they were driven out of England, and afterwards cruelly killed by the Pope.

I Answer touching the first point (to wit, of prayer) that it is a very poore one, to suppose these two for two Protestants. For I pray did not diuers repaire to the pond of Probatica to offer vp their prayers there, which could be cured no where else? Or will M. Presto say, that Angels descend from heauen, and mooue all waters, as the Angell did that? Or that the man who expected there so many yeares, might as well haue bene healed by entring into the standing poole wherein his wiues Ducks and Geese do swimme? Who but M. Preston will dare to say so?

Touching the 2. and 3. point of rayling against the Pope and sea of Rome (besides what hath bene already said) I say farther, that it is a poore conceit of M. Preston to argue thus. Gerardus and Dulcinus, railed against the Pope and sea of Rome: Ergo, they were good and perfect Protestants. For so Puritans, and Brownists might claime them for honest

honest men, and of their sect, who railed against the Queene her selfe, her English Bishops, and other like Prelates, as *Iohn Stow* anno *Eliz.* 33. testifieth that *Hacket* did, when he was hanged in Cheapside. For shame learne to argue more solidly.

But here I would haue you to know, that *M. Preston* hath one very bad propertie, which he vsually vseth in many of his testimonies: which is, to hide nothing, but to tell all that he can finde any lewed Hereticke to haue spit out against the Pope, but neuer tell any damnable point whatsoever they held against Protestants: example wherof we haue in these two present witnesses *Gerardus* and *Dulcinus*. (Alias *Begguardi* & *Beguini*.) who were the very first founders of that most brutall and beastly sect, which at this day we call by the name of *the family of loue*; yea, and yet worse then they, beleeued (so that the fornication were committed, in any caue or cellar vnder ground) that God himselfe was ignorant of it. O what iust cause now hath *M. Preston* to cry out, and say. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do?* or I totally vp this for his 32. vntruth?

His 2. Protestant Witnes.

2. *Theobald Archbishop of Canterburie, With the Prelats of England, in a councell held at London, anno 26. Stephani Regis, decreed, that Bishops should line more discretely. That priests should not be Rulers ouer worldly matters. That they should teach their flocks*

more dilligently. And that the people should read the scriptures, and learne the Lords prayer and Creed in English.

I Answer. What is there in all this, which any Catholique Bishop in the world, may not ordaine at this day? Surely, if this may make *Theobald* (so great a Papist) to be a Protestant, there is neuer a Catholique Bishop in the world (no not the Pope himselfe) but may be reputed for a Protestant. Only I finde *M. Preston* to be taken tardy in the last point, to wit, *that the people should read the scriptures.* For *John Fox* pag. 359, reciting the same articles, to the number of no lesse then 31. setteth the 7. in number thus downe. *That in Monasteries the reading of the scriptures should be more frequented:* which greatly differs from that which *M. Prestons* puts downe, naming the people, where *Fox* nameth *Monasteries:* and adding after in the *English* tongue, where the words of the decree, name neither *English, French,* nor any language at all: the language vted in Monasteries to read scriptures, being only the *Latin* tōgue. What a shamefull corruption then hath he committed in this place?

Moreouer, besides that this good Bishop was himselfe a *Benedictine Monke*, after an *Abbot*, consecrated of the *Popes Legat*, receiued his *Bishops Pall* from *Pope Innocent* the second, said *Mass*, praid to *Saints*, held *purgatorie* & the like (*Prudèrall Ballance* pag. 210.) it is a world to see, what *John Fox* himselfe saith of him, and of 31. decrees of a *Sinod* holden by him, out of which it

is very probable *M. Preston* collected, what he here delivereth of him. Fox pag. 115. col. 1. n. 84. anno 747. Which truly, if he did, must needs lay him open to be a man of a most lewed conscience; for there he could not choose but see many articles in particular, which quite confound his Protestant Church, as especially concerning Monasteries, Monkes and Nunnes, about which there are no lesse then 7. severall decrees in that one Sinod, besides those he made about the same Monks (as Fox confesseth) in a former.

Now, how for Gods sake can this hang together? In the precedent Centuries, sundry persons are put downe for Protestants, only for that they were mortal enemies to Monkes, Friars and Religious persons. And yet in this place. *Theobald* (so great a friend to Monkes, yea him selfe a Monke, & Father of Monkes) is put downe by *M. Preston* for a Protestant? Surely, either the man must needs blush when he readeth this, or else there is no bloud at all in his face, but bearing in outward shew a face of flesh, it is indeed a face of brasle.

But if this which hath already bene said about this *Theobald*, hath not done it, this which followeth I hope will, vnlesse the man be past all grace (which God bid.) For in the 17. article of this sinod, *Iohn Fox* speaking of *S. Augustine* our Apottle, saith thus. Fox *supra*. That the feast of *S. Gregorie* and *S. Augustine* our patron, be obserued. Now you well remember *Master Prestons* words about *S. Aug.* saying thus. *Augustine the Monke,*

brought in Poperie. He found true religion here, he did not conuert England, but did peruerse it, thus he; Which supposed, how is it possible that *Theobald* the Monke, and *M. Preston* the Minister, were both Protestants? Both of the same Church? and both of the same beliefe and faith? The Monke maketh him the man that conuerted vs: the Minister, the man that peruered vs: The Monke, him that brought true religion to vs: the Minister, him that tooke true religion from vs. In a word, the monke, to preserue a pious and perpetual memorie of him appointeth a festiual day to be kept thorough out the whole Kingdome: the Minister endeuoreth to roote his memorie out of the minde of man. O the pouertie, o the miserie, o the malice of Ministers, endeavoring to deceiue the simple, with the counterfet succession, and vpstart pedigree of their predecessors? But as a foole will not sel his bable for a Kinges ransom, so who shall let *Master Preston* to repeat his old song. *Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.*

His 3. Protestant Witnes.

3. *King Henrie the first, and his Nobles, were euen at the point to forsake the Romish Church.*

This is false: for (besides that *Walsingame* pag. 38. names four Monasteries which he built for Popish Monkes) admit it were so, how can *Master Preston* thus conclude. *King Henrie with his Nobles, were euen at the point to forsake the Romish Church: Ergo he de facto forsooke it: or,*
here

here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do? For so it would follow, that he that were at the point of death, were dead indeed: and he at the point of hanging (as many an one is who yet escapes the galloes) were hanged indeed?

To what a poore and distressed *Point*, is the Protestant Church reduced, whom to support from falling into the pit of perpetuall shame, for lack of prooffe of her perpetuities, is forced to sustaine her selfe with such pillars, as were about to vnder-prop her, but did not? were at the *Point* to helpe her, but left her helpes? were at the *Point* to ioyne them selues to her, but neuer touched ioynt of her? O poore distressed Protestant Church?

His 4. Protestant witness.

4. *Ioannes Sarisburiensis; called the cleargie Pharisee, and false teachers: the pope Antechrist, and Rome Babilon.*

Answer. This ware now growes so stale, that it begins to stinke. Giue vs reason: let rayling go?

His 5. Protestant witness.

5. *Petrus Blesensis, exhorted the people to go out of Babylon,*

Answer. He did so indeed, but ment it of such Babilonian Churches as yours be: Himselfe being a Roman Catholique, could not exhort men to go out of that Church, wherinto him selfe entred. To this therefore I returne no other answer but only, Buzz: or set it vp vpon my tallie for your 35. *vngrub*

His 6. Protestant Witness.

6. *Gualterus Mapes*, seeing the pride of the Pope, of his Cardinalls and Prelats, their luxurie and couesousnes, writes thus.

*Roma mundi caput est, sed nil capit mundani
Quod pendet à capite, totum est immundum.*

*Pluto Romanus Pontifex, quem animal brutū,
stercus & lutum appellat.*

Answer. *Lutum*, signifies, a baudie slauē, and what a dishonest Protestant pander then was this *Mapes*, to stand and looke on vpon such beastly lewednes, and not once put to his handes to pul the knawes and whores a sunder? Where was his zeale of the gospel? his loue to the Lord? Or rather did not the Protestant spirit, so moue, and so pittifull prick *Mapes*, to haue enclosed the popes faire lasse betwixt his owne lecherous armes, that for meere pittie of his owne paine, he would not hinder the popes pastime?

But lest we do the Pope wrong, and deeme for a truth, a damnable lye, what I pray was the Popes name? What the Cardinalls? What their Paramours? Where, and when were these filthie facts committed? What prooffe? What triall? what testimonie of the truth? Who is *Mapes* to be beleeued in such a matter? Or rather doth not this wicked *Walter*, for his lying, deserue the halter? Wherefore vntill *M. Preston* answeres pertinently vnto these demandes, I will demand leaue of him, to leaue the turd he talkes of in *Mapes* mouth. Fie, Fie, you a Minister that preaches

ches the word, and to talke of a turd! you A Minister, treating of Theological controuersie, and to breake into tearmes of plaine baudery? you a deuine, and to dip your pen in such dirt? Wel prophesied S. Cyprian, long since of this Master Preston and his like, saying. *Amongst prophane men that ar departed from the Church, and from whose breasts the holy Ghost is departed, what else is to be found, but a depraued minde, a deceitfull tongue, cankered hatred, and sacrilegious lying.* lib. 1. epist. 2.

The end of the 4. age.

To summe vp this Centurie, M. Preston haue produced seauen Protestant witnesses for prooofe of his Churches perpetuitie, Gerardus and Dulcinus, haue not a word, nor handle any point of importance, but only rayling against the Pope, and sea of Rome. Henrie the 1. and his Nobles, a supposed splene against Rome. Ioannes Salisburghenses, nothing but rayling against the Pope and sea of Rome, as Gerardus and Dulcinus did afore. Petrus Blesensis for pretended rayling against Rome. Laitly Maple fac'd Mapes, the mayne ring-leader of this race of raylers (for as for Theobald he hath nothing against vs worth the noting.) so that M. Prestons Church of this age, consisted only of a company of Raylers: nor no point of faith was in practise in his Protestant Church of this age, but only this prime point of Protestant rayling. Which supposed, I will reduce M. Prestons discourte in to forme, as thus.

There was our Church, and they profest the

faith we do, who soeuer railed soundly & roundly against the Pope and sea of Rome.

But these zealous seruants of the Lord, railed soundly and roundly against the Pope and sea of Rome, calling him, Antechrist, the great God of hell, Brute beast, Turd, and Baudie slaue: her, whoore of Babilon, and the like.

Ergo there was our Church, and they profest the faith we do.

And thus, rayling at the Pope and see of Rome, is made by *M. Presto* an article of his English faith, which at the next parlamentall assembly, he shall do well to exhibit a bill to haue it added to the 39. English articles, to make them vp iust fortie. Or, where hitherto they admit but only two markes to discerne their Church (preaching of the word, and administration of the Sacraments) he procure this to bee added for the third, rayling roundly against the Pope and sea of Rome, else neuer will it suffice to proue his assertion. *Here was our Church, and they profest the faith we do.*

*Centurie 5. of his Protestant Wittneses, from
anno 1017. to 1117.*

1. **A** Bout this time, the King of England, fauored not much the sea of Rome, neither would he suffer any of his subjects to goe to Rome. *Mat. Paris.*
Answer. This is much like to that a litle before of Henrie the first, being at the point of forsaking the Church of Rome. Who euer heard such rusty reasons,

reasons, in a matter of such importance? Well conclude, I pray, ether like a scholler, or like a Colliar, as you will winne credit by the conclusion. *Ergo, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.* Who is so simple, as sees not, that these, and the like arguments of *M. Prestons*, resemble right the Spyders webbe: painfully wrought, but to no purpose?

His 2. Protestant Witnes.

2. *Marian Scotus*, living in the dayes of Edward the Confessor, reproveth the practise of the papists.

Answer. You slander *Scotus*, who was a true Roman Catholique in all points, neuer professing so much as one of your 39. articles, in opposition to vs. Againe, if you were not one of those, who rather loued darknes then light, you ought to haue plainly told vs in what he reproveth papists? Whether for their faith, or for their maners? If for their maners, doe not you Ministers in your daylie sermons, reprove many practises among Protestants? Will you therefore admit a papist thus to conclude against a Protestant? *Here was our (papist) Church, and these (good Ministers) profess the same faith we (papists) do?* If not, pluck in your hornes for shame, and neuer soile paper more, with so flutrish a penne.

His 3. Protestant Witnes.

3. *Vnder the raigne of King Canutus*, diuers points of our Religion were maintained. 1. Iustification by faith. 2. Obedience in all sorts to Magistrates.

Answer. I pittie you *M. Preston*, who still bring

more sackes to mill, but alwaies filld with mustie corne: so here the dismasking of your disloyall marchandise. For *Iustification by faith*, no papist in the world, ever did or doth deny it: are they therefore all Protestants? One naughtie herbe (as the proverbe saith) spoiles a whole pot of pottage: and you haue here left out the principall hearb, which should haue giuen the principall tast to your Protestant pottage; to wit, the hearbe called *Only*. That faith iustificieth, we confesse: that *only* faith doth the same, this we deny. You enueuour nought elle, but to deceiue.

Touching *obedience in all sorts vnto Magistrats*, where finde you, I pray you, that any papist teacheth the contrary? I could proue vnto you, that many Protestant doe. *Iohn Knox*, a member of and brother of your holy brotherhood, taught, that *Princes may be deposed, if they be tyrants against God and his truth*. Hist. Scot. pag 78. 372. *Buchanan* (another of your blessed brethren) taught that, *the people may arraigne their prince, and depose him*; and that for their paines, it were good such reward should be appoyned, *as there are for those that kill Wolves and Beares*. De iure Reg. pag. 61. 13. 25. 58. 40. 62. hence therefore, and neuer more truly may *M. Preston* singe his viuall song, and say. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profeſt the faith we do.*

Laitly for Kinge Canutus himselfe, and to shew that in all his examples, hee endeouours nothing more then to deceiue, first, this Kinge went to
Win-

Winchester (as both Fox pag. 163. Stow pag. 120. and others write) and taking his crowne from off his head, set it vpon the head of the Crucifix.

Secondly, the same Fox saith of him, that, following much the superstition of Agelnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury, he went on pilgrimage to Rome. pagina 163.

Thirdly, that he did this, because he beleueed, that S. Peter the Apostle, had receiued great power of our Lord, of binding and loosing; and that he is the porter of heauen.

Fourthly he built, saith the same Fox, S. Benets in Norfolke and turned S. Edmunds Bury, into an Abbey of Monkes: so that frendes to Monkes (as well as enimies) ar made Protestants, euen when it pleaseth M. Preston.

Fiftly Bale saith of him (cent. 3. cap. 45.) *It is found, that next after God; he endeouored to appease S. Edmund, by prayers and offeringes.* So that all M. Preston getteth by producing this witnes, he may (I wolle) put in his eye and see neuer the worse, saue only to multiply yⁿtrusts without measure.

The end of the 5. age.

To summe vp this fitt Centurie, so short that it consists but of three witnessles, to wit, of an English King without name, who fauored not much the sea of Rome, of Marianus Scotus, an absolute Cathol que, and of King Canutus, as ranke a Papist, as euer raigned, who sees not in how poore a hole M. Prestons Church hid her head in this age?

Againe,

Againe, two of these being Kinges, and the third no Bishop, it followeth, that M. Preston had no Church at all in this age. For no Bishop no priest: no priest, no religion: no religion, no Church, as I have already proued; and consequently, it is a plaine deceit in Master Preston, hauing no Church at all, to sing vnto vs this deceitful song. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.*

*Centurie 6. Of his Protestant witnesses
from anno 917. to 1017.*

1. **T**He cleargie of England in a councel held anno 975. withstood Dunstons prohibition of priests marriage.

Answer. Had you told the whole tale, as you told but a peece, you should haue added, that the house wherein the councell was gathered, fel, and those priests there withal killed, or sore wounded, S. Dunstan, and those that toke his part, remaying safe with out any hurt. *Malmesb. in vita S. Dunstan.*

His 2. Protestant witness.

2. Edwin banished Dunstan, and his order, and placed married priests in their Romes.

Answer. This was only but one point, will this alone suffice to make that cleargie become Protestants, who in all the rest were absolute papists? Or doth the Kings passionat fact, forth with conclude the thing lawful?

Touching

Touching S. Dunstan, Godwine a Protestant saith thus of him. He was admired for a most holie and virtuous man, and after canonized for a Saint. The like hath Bale, Cent. 2. pag. 38. And Malm's lib. 1. Pont. pag. 202. saith of this blessed Saint. He adorned the steps of his promotion, with vnwearied virtues: those times were happie, which had such a prelat, as did nothing lesse, then he said: and further, addeth much of his virtues & miracles: all which is to be seene in the prudentiall Ballance.

This said, both of the King, and of S. Dunstane. what litle cause hath M. Preston thus to crack. Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do? Or what English Parson, euer out pitcht Master Preston, for idle, poore, and pedling arguments?

His 3. Protestant Wines.

3. The English cleargie in this age; were peremptorie against the Real presence.

I answer first, that peremptorily, I suspect him of false play, vntill he purge him selfe by naming the parties, and the particular decrees or workes they wrote to oppose the same. For it is no small crime, to accuse the whole English cleargie, of a fact, wherein he will be neuer able, to finde the hundred part guiltie.

I answer secondly, that this againe is but one only point, and they being papists in all the rest, how poore a thing is it of M. Preston, to make them Protestants for this alone? He Will rather play,

play, at smale games, then set out, and veresie this English verse.

*To feede of flesh, t'is gluttonie
and makes men fat like swine.*

*But was not he a frugal man
that on a lease could dine?*

I answer *thirdly*, that in opposing the Real presence, he plainly discovereth him selfe to be a Puritan, and no Protestant, For the 28. article of the English Church, directly teacheth, that *the body of Christ, is giuen, taken, and eaten*, in the supper: which is impossible, denying the real presence. For the body of Christ being a real thinge, if it be giuen, taken and eaten: a real thinge must needes be giuen, taken and eaten: else this absurditie would ensue, that a real thinge may be giuen, taken, and eaten, and yet no real thinge at all, touched, handled, or receiued: which plainly implieth contradiction.

I answer *fourthly*, that all the best learned English Protestants at this day, clearly grant a Real presence: see one in steed of many Master Richard Montague, in his preface to the Gage of the new gospel, pag. 12. saying thus. *This is my body, which we deny not, ether in words, or sence. The very body of Christ. Really receiued in the Sacrament of the Altar.* Againe, position 35. pag. 250. he saith thus. *He gaue substance, and (note) Real subsisting essence, who said, this is my body, this is my blood.* And pag. 251. yet more plainly. *The body and blood of Christ, taken and eaten in the Lords supper, not the figure and*
signe

figne of his body and blood, which can nether be take,
nor yet eaten: Poore Woodcock or Catholick Cocks-
combe, that sendest a Protestant to seeke a figure, who
is (note) as Real and substantiall, as any Papist.
And lastly, pag. 253. he saith thus. Protestants say
it not, they neuer said it.

Now I pray recall to minde, this third testi-
monie of M. Prestons. *The English cleargie in this
age, were peremptorie against the Reallpresence. And
compare the same with these other words of M.
Montague: who three or foure severall times in
so few lines, vseth the very word Real, therby to
proue the Reallpresence. Call also to minde, that
M. Preston, put downe this deniall of the Realpre-
sence, as a point to proue the perpetuitie of Pro-
testants Church, and her standing in opposition
against Papists: and M. Montagues asseueration,
that Protestants say it not: they neuer said it, calling
the Catholick, Cocks-combe, for so saying. Whence
to close vp this discourse, I thus conclude.*

Ether the English cleargie M. Preston speaketh
of, were no Protestants, and he belyeth them, or
M. Montague belies both M. Preston, and that En-
glish cleargie also. Which if M. Montague will not
grant (as I thinke he will not) the to end the mat-
ter, let them two goe together by the eares, which
of them shall carry away the Cocks-combe frō the
Catholicke: meane while I will proceed to exa-
mine the rest of M. Prestons counterfet Catalogue.

His 4. Protestant Wines.

Ælfricus, Archbishop of Canterburie, anno 996.

Wrose

Wrote an epistle to Wolsine Bishop of Sherborne, against the housling of the Sacrament. And another epistle to Wolslane Archbishop of Yorke, against Transubstantiation.

Answer, as before, this is but one point. One Swallow, makes no summer: nor can one, or two points alone, make a Protestant.

Secondly, I plainly suspect him here, as I did before, of false play, vnles he put downe the expresse wordes, and tell vs where, and in what Author those two epistles are to be found, as I do to him, when I cite ought out of Protestant Authors.

Thirdly, that which I returned for answer to his last example, of the English cleargie, I am content he take it also for an answer to this.

Fourthly, let him know, that this *Ælfricus*, was the 26. Archbishop after *S. Aug.* of whom we find little written, because the rage of the *Danes*, was most furious in his time: yet of his Roman Religion, there is no reason to dout, for as *Godwine* witnesseth, he was brought vp in *Glastenburie*. discipule (as *Bale* saith cent. 2. cap. 41.) of *S. Ethwald*, and Abbot of *Abigdon*, and for his craft (saith he) in promoting *Papistrie*, made Archbishop of *Canterburie*. How vnprobable is it then, that this *Ælfricus*, was a Protestant of *M. Prestons Church*, and beleeued as he did, as he most deceitfullie would make you belecue, as though Abbots *Mōkes*, and Massing priests, were all Protestants?

The end of the 6. age.

To summe vp this 6. centurie, contayning only
four

four testimonies, to wit, two, touching the marriage of priests: and other two, concerning the Reall presence, who is so simple that sees not, the encrease of *M. Prestons* pouertie, for prooffe of his Church? And to what miserable shifts the poore man is brought, that is forced thus to put downe so manifest old Papists, for new Protestants, only to stop vp emptie holes, where he had no other straw, hay, nor stubble to put? Neuer can he from hence, honestly conclude. *Here was our Church, and they profess the same faith we do.*

Centurie 7. Of his Protestant witnesses from
annd 817. to 917.

1. **K**ing Alfred caused the psalter, and diuers other parcells of holy scripture, to be translated into the English tongue, that the English might be the better acquainted with the same.

I answer, admit he did, can hee thence conclude (without fraud) *here was our Church, and he profess the same faith that we do?* Nay, *M. Preston* shall yet haue offered him more faire play then all this, and I will admit his vicious conclusion for good and currant, vpon condition he will giue another man leaue to conclude so as well as himselfe, or recall his false conclusion. Thus then I argue.

The Rhemiste priests (those notorious Popelings) translated the whole Bible, both new and old, into the English tongue, that the English might

might be the better acquainted with the same. Ergo, those notorious Popelinges, were also of *M. Prestons* Church, and profess the same faith that he and other Protestants do. Tell me, *M. Tobie*, doth not your stomach begin to loath this Protestant loablesnes? And with the Israelites to say; *Our soule hateth this light meate?*

His 2. Protestant Writnes.

2. *Ioannes Scotus* wrote a booke of the body and blood of our Lord: for which, and other of his positions, contrarie to the opinion of the popish Church, he was accused of the Pope for an Hereticke, and was murdered.

I answer, May not a man write a booke of the bodie and blood of our Lord, for which he may deserue to be condemned for an Hereticke? For example, if he should deny in the B. Sacrament of the Altar (euen as some Protestants call it) that Christs body and blood, is nether giuen Really, nor Sacramentally, nor Symbolically, nor Figuratiuely, nor by faith, nor yet was no Sacrament at all, deserued not such an one to be throwen alieue into the fire, yea though it were some speciall friend of *M. Prestons*? Why brings he forth then such blind prootes, wherein there is nether head nor tayle, rhyme, nor reason? Discouers he not herein, that his principall drift is nothing else but to deceiue, & to draw such simple soules as your selfe, blindly after him to the pit of hell? Wherefore let him learne to speake more plainly, and to set downe particularly, what the opinion was, or
herafter

hereafter hold his peace. Lastly, aske him if he will defend the doctrine that *Scotus* did, both in that, and in other points? Aske him if he will defend, that *Scotus* held but two Sacraments? Or that his other positions, were the 39. articles of his English Church. He dares as well eate a hot horse-nayle, as doe this. Why then, the point being only one, and the partie that held it, differing from Protestants in infinit others, how may he with modestie say. *Here was our Church, and he profess the faith we doe?*

His 3. Protestant Witnes.

3. *Nætus* and *Weresbithus*, at the sametime here in England, were of the same opinion.

Answer. Hee tels vs that these two were of the same opinion that *Scotus* was, but neuer tels what the opinion was which *Scotus* held. This is to finde out *ignotum, per magis ignotum*. Blessed God who euer met with such a Blunderer? See you not as cleare as day, that the Ministers drift is wholie to deceiue? Then aske him againe, whether these two companions of *Scotus*, held but two Sacraments, denied purgatorie, prayer to Saints, free-will, with the other 39. new coyned articles which Protestants maintaine against Catholiques? Else in vaine is his vaunting brag. *Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.*

I an. 2. that *Nætus* (or *Neothus*) was a Monke of Glaffenburie, to whom K. *Alfred* gaue a peece of the holy Crosse, sent vnto him by the Pope. And as for *Weresbithus*, he put into English *S. Gre-*

gories dialogues, of which *Luther* saith, that the diuel led the Author by the nose in writing of the. What apparance then that these two, were two Protestants? And how may not this be notched vp for his 40. vntruth.

His 4. Protestant Witnes.

4. *Michael Balbus, against Images.*

I answer 1. This was but one man only, who in this 7. age opposed Images: but hee alone (not boulding all other points with Protestants) can not make a Church. Ergo he cannot conclude. *Here was our Church, and he profess the faith we do.*

I could also answer, that he tell vs not what he wrote against Images, and so endeouours still, by this deceitfull proceedings, to draw his Disciples into darknes. For put case he wrote against Images, that they were not to be worshipped for God, he was to haue bene praised for so writing, nor would any Catholique complaine of him. This I tel him, that he talke not thus in the clouds: and, that if he will medle in such matter as these, that he teach his pen to speake more plainly, or put him vp into his pen-case.

But to answer more to the purpose, and to come vp more close to *M. Preston*, so to shew you how the old master, seekes to abuse his filly disciple, you ar to know, that this *Michael Balbus*, was indeed an open enimie vnto Chrillian Images, and (as being Emperor) of power enough to do much milchiefe vnto Catholiques. But what, thinke you in the meane space he was a Protestāt?

No

No such matter. See *Cedrenus* and *Zonaras*.

For, first, he beleeued not the Ruseurrection.
2. He denied there were any Diuels. And 3. with the Iewes, he kept the saboth insteed of the Sunday. Which premised, I am content that *M. Preston* sing a loud his Cuckoes songe. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith that we do.* Hoping in God you will be none of that quire, where such black Saints ar masters of the chappel. O the danger you ar in to be conducted by such a deceiver?

The end of this 7. age.

To summe vp this centurie, containyng only four testimonies, to wit, 1. that of King *Alfred*, for causyng certaine parcelles of Scripture to be translated into the English tongue 2. That of *Scotus*, *Noetus* and *Weresbithus* against the body and blood of Lord (not telling in what.) 3. That of *Michael Balbus* against Images: The points of opposition against the Church of Rome, being in all but three. The witnesses but five. The first witness *K. Alfred* an absolute Papist; The point making nothing for *M. Preston*, nor against vs. *Scotus* *Noetus* and *Weresbithus*, not proued to hold any other point of Protestanisme with *M. Preston*. And the last, *Balbus*, being a Iew, in al points (but circumcision) and consequently, not beleeuing in Christ, you finde I hope, that to be true, which I so often told you, to wit, that Protestants were neuer able to shew any man to be of theire Religion, before the dayes of *Martin Luther*.

Centurie 4. Of his Protestant Witneses, from
anno 717. to 817.

1. **B**ertram wrote a booke against Transubstantiation, which booke is now extant.

I answer, this Spiders webbe is so weake, that it is not able to catch a flie. I told you but even now, that one man, holding with you but one point only against vs, can not serue you in this distresse, seeking for your forlorne Church, which as you see, you cannot finde. Nor sufficeth it that Bertram held this one point against Papists, holding ten for one against Protestants. For whom it was impossible to hold the 39. English Articles, they not being enacted till eight hundred yeares, or there about after Bertrams dayes. And therfore still he seekes to deceiue you, if hence he will conclude. Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.

His 2. Protestant Witnes.

2. Alcuinus, and the Bishops of England, wrote an epistle to the French King, against setting vp of Images, and other popish practises.

I answer, were it true, still the point was but one. Next both Alcuinus, and the English Bishops of this age, said Masse, offered sacrifice, praied to Saints, beleueed Purgatorie and the like, and therefore could be no Protestants. And that you may see M. Preston the more confounded, the English Archbishops of Canterbury of this age, were 1.

Tacwin,

Tacuin, of the rule of *S. Bennet* 2. *Cutbert*, who appointed *S. Aug.* day to be kept holy day. 3. *Bregwin* a Monke 4. *Lambert*, an Abbot. 5. *Ethelard* a Monke and Abbot, all of the popish order, as may be scene in the Prudentiall Balance, euen by the confession of Protestants them selues. And as for *Alcuinus* in particular, I report me to the booke he wrote in defence of papistrie; namely to that intituled *De Diuinis officijs*, explicating the ceremonies of the Masse. Will you then rely any longer vpon such a deceiuer, telling you. *Here was our church, and they profess the faith we do?*

3. *Beda*, translated *Iohns gospel* into English.

I answer. This obiection I haue shewed to be ridiculous by the example of the Rhemists, cent. 7. numb. 1. wherto I refer me. But here, woe be to *M. Preston*, for now, not I, but his owne schollar, will be able to take him tripping, and to discouer his false and fraudulent dealing, by tracing his footsteps in our English historie, written by the same *S. Bede*, pretended by *M. Preston* to be a Protestant; Behold the particulars.

First, besides that he was him selfe a Monke and priest of the order of *S. Benet* (pag. 65. of fiftie two learned bookes which he wrote, two of them were of the chronicles of his owne Abby, and of the liues and miracles of sundry Saints) you shall finde in the 27. page of the same historie, no lesse then 45. seuerall differences (collected by Doct. *Stapleton*) betwixt the religion he professed and approued, and that of our present

Protestants. As, amongst others, saying of Masse, houlding it for a sacrifice, Confession of sinnes to a prielt, Satisfaction and Penance enioyned for them, Merit of good workes, Intercession of Saints, after holy orders Priests not to marry, vowes of Chastitie in both sexes, Monkes and Virgins liuing in cloisters, prayer for the Dead, Reseruatiō of the Sacrament, houseling before death, Pilgrimage to holy places, Reliques of Saints, Miracles wrought by them, blessing with the Crosse, Seruice in the Latin tongue, holy Altars, holy Vessels, Altar clothes, holy water, vse of Images, and lastly, Appeales to the Pope and see of Rome, so much despised by *M. Preston*.

Now I beseeche you *M. Toby*, for sweet *Iesus* sake, yea, I further coniuere you, as both you and I shall answer the same at the day of iudgement, that you examine *Beda*, and consider this point particularly, together with the wronge *Master Preston* doth you? vpon whom you haue hitherto depended: who hauing in this his Catalogue, thorough out euery Centurie, challenged those for members of his Protestant Church, who most earnestly and desperatlie opposed the Church of Rome in most of the very points here specified, blusheth not, now to bring in *Beda* for a Protestar, who helde them all, and many more against him selfe and these Protestants.

What say you now, to such disloyall and dishonest dealing? What thinke you of such deceiuers? Haue they any conscience, any honestie,
any

any religion, who will set forth religion with such notorious vntruths? haue they any church, any faith at all (though they falsly brag. *Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we doe*) that are found not only so churchles, but so faithles in their relations? I haue often told you, that Ministers were most strang men: and that they vpheld their religion for the most part, whollie with such rotten posts; and finde you not now my words to be true? Yea, ~~we~~ be bold to say, that had you the workes of other authors your Master alleadgerh, as you haue of this, you should finde him no lesse faultie in them, then you do in this. Which certaintie is so grosse and shameles, euen in this citation alone, as he may iustly blush therat.

His 4. Protestant Witnes.

4. *Adelbertus, and Clemens about this time, preached against the Popes Supremacie, Traditions, Images, Purgatorie, Masse for the dead, and in defence of priests mariages.*

I answer. If it be *Adelbertus Pragensis* whom he meanes, he abuses him (in making him a Protestant) as he did *S. Bede*. For first he was a religious monke and Abbot (a profession so hatefull thorough out this whole discourse, to *M. Preston*)
2. He went to Rome, and obtained a great conuoye of the Pope to goe into Hungarie, where he Baptised Stephen the Kinges sonne; and afterwards was crowned with martyrdom. *Sanders* *visib. Monarchie*. Now how absurd is it to ima-

gine, that had he preached against the Popes Supremacie, Traditions, Images, Purgatorie, Masse for the dead, and in defence of Priestes mariages, (as *M. Preston* pretendeth) or had bene one of his Protestant Church, that euer the Pope would haue receiued him, or assisted him as he did? Or do Protestants vse to goe to the Pope (to Antechrist, to the great god of hell, to that Brute beast, and baudie slugg, to aske connoyes to conduct and guard them? What Christian hart but must needes tremble with horror, to heare Gods supreme vicar so villanized, highest authoritie so blasphemed, and inferior Doctors of the Church so abused, to bolster vp this base heresie?

True it is, I finde another *Adelbertus*, with one *Clemens*, two notable imposters, that went about to make them selues be worshiped of the people. In particular, this *Adelbertus*, made the people beleue, that he had receiued at the handes of an Angel, certaine Reliques of singular efficacie, which he proposed to them to be adored. He compared him selfe in sanctitie to the Apostles. He dedicated Churches in his owne name, and honor. To such as came to confession to him, he would make them beleue, that he knew before hande, their sinnes by reuelation, and so would absolue them vnconfessed. He ioyned the paringes of his nayles, and his haire together with the reliques of *S. Peter*, to be worshipped of the people. He inuocated Angels vnder strange names; The prayer he vsed, and taught others, was as followeth.

followeth. *Precor vos, & conuro vos, & supplico me ad vos, Angelus Vriel, Angelus Raquel, Angelus Tubeuel, Angelus Michael, Angelus Adinus, Angelus Tubuas, Angelus Sabaoth, Angelus Simphel.* These were his impostures, condemned by Pope Zachary in a councell at R. me: a man full of horrible pride and hypocrisie, who at last pretended to have received an epistle from heaven, wherein he was declared to be Iesus Christ. Which epistle being read in the councell, he was condemned, and deprived of his priestly office. See the acts of this councell in Baroni. tom. 9, anno 745.

As for *Clemens* his companion, he was euen such another impostor as *Adelbertus* was. To tell you briefly some of the wicked points he held; He brought in Iudaisme into the Church, namely, that the brother was to marry his brothers wife, if the brother deceased without issue. That Christ descending into hell, deliuered thence, not only the faithfull, but also Infidels and worshippers of Idols. With many more like grosse absurdities, which I omit, for which he was condemned by the same councell. Now if it were this last *Adelbertus* which *M. Preston* pretendeth to be a Protestant member of his Church (as most like it is) either he must hold both their damned opinions (as being much elder and before him) or else if he dissent from them in these, how can he ioyne with them in other? Lord what stinking kennels doth this poore man rake, to finde out Protestants to patch vp a Church?

M. Tobie,

M. Tobie, I haue often told you and forewarned you of this their vngodly dealing: you see it here, and haue seene it often in this discourse: hardly shall you finde one only of all his testimonies, not stuffed with notorious vntruths. Ministers might quite shut vp their shop windoes, if they should be letted to set lyes to sale. Doctor *Harding* and others haue discovered only in fiew of the six and twentie articles of M. *Iewels* reply, to the said *Hardinges* answer to his Apologie, aboue a thousand and od lies. Doctor *Stapleton* in his Returne of vntruths, taxeth him in that one booke, with no lesse then 561. lyes. The same *Stapleton* taxeth Bishop *Horne*, with no lesse then 690. vntruthes in one booke called the Counterblast. I should make no end if I should set downe the innumerable vntruths which we daylie discover in euery litle controuersie that passeth thorough their false fingers. Rightly therefore prophecied the Prince of the Apostles, of these men, intituling them. *Lying Masters, which shall bring in sects of perdition.* 2. Pet. 2. 1. And S. Paul plainly saith of these reuolters from the faith in the latter dayes, that they shall speake, lyes in hipocrisie, hauing their conscience seared. 1. Tim. 4. 2. Whereunto excellently agrees that great Doctor S. *Hilarie*, saying. Vpon defection from the faith, waireth lying & hipocrisie; so that they keepe the shew of godlines in their wordes, the truth wherof they haue cast out of their conscience. Lib. 5. de Trinit. Fly then these false Masters. Withdraw your selfe from these deceiuers. Sayle to the

the Castle of Catholique sincerity. Ioyne and fasten your selfe to those, who scorne to fight or defend their cause with so base weapons.

The end of this 8. age.

To summe vp this centurie, consisting only of four or five testimonies 1. that of *Bertrame* only against Transubstantiation 2. that of *Alcuinus* only against Images. 3. that of *Beda*. only for translating *S. Iohns* gospell into English, and 4. of *Adelbertus* and *Clemens*, against sundry other points of poperie; all foure being notorious papists (except *Bertram* in one only point, & ill vnderstood :) The heads of controuersie so few. The witnesses so few in number. So falsly claymed and pretended, who is so sillie as sees not to what extremitie these poore men are brought, when they are put to proue their Church; No Arian, no Nestorian, no Manichean, nor other damned hereticks that euer was, but might produce as good proofs, and conclude as pertinently against Papists as *M. Preston* doth, saying. *Here was our Church, and they profest the same faith we do.*

*Centurie 9. Of his Protestant witnesses,
from anno 617. to 417.*

1. **A** Idan, Fynian, Coleman, Cutbertus, Incomanus, these preached well; abhorred, the papall pompe, and had many bitter controuersies with the court of Rome.

1. Answer. Fie on this poperie, fie on this fraud,

fraud, this man hath made a league with lying, all his endeuours tend to deceiue. He saith *these men preached well*: neuer telling what they preached; was it not against Protestants? For they were most of them Monkes and Massing priests, of whom Beda the Monke maketh mention. This is iust as if I should claime Luther, Calvin, Beza, and the rest of that crue, for Roman Catholiques, and say of them thus. *These preached well, abhorred the pompe of Protestants, and had many bitter controuersies with the court of England*, as their followers also haue to this very day, and then conclude: *here was our Church and they profest the faith we do.*

Touching their *bitter controuersies with the court of Rome*, he is to be suspected of his ordinarie lashing, for had it bene so bitter as he would make it, is he now become so sweet and curteous to that court, as that he would haue concealed it? It were to expect too speedy a change from a man so spitefull, as M. Preston hath hitherto protested himselfe against the Pope. Well, to the end I may not loose my labor, I will, if he please lay twenty Angells to ten, that they were not so bitter by many degrees, as these which his owne English bretheren in the Lord, belche forth against the Popes of London, and Lambeth, and against their English papall court. Let him plainly, and without deceit put downe the one, as I doe the other, and your selfe iudge and compare them together.

They are, *the greatest, and most pestilent enimies,*
that

that the state of England hath. Vnlawfull, false and
bastardly gouernors of the Church, thrust in by ordonance
of the diuell. Pettie Antechrists, Cogging, and
cosoning knaues. Profane, paltrie, pernicious, pestilent
Prelats. In respect of their places, enemies of God. Their
calling meere Antechristian. Dang. Posit. lib. 20. c. 12.

Now had Aydan, Fynian and the rest, but roared
halse so loud, against the court of Rome, as these men
do against the court of Canterburie, would M. Preston
thinke you haue concealed it? Beleeue it that list, yea
rather assure your selfe it was so sweet (in comparison
of this) that he was ashamed to set it downe.

His 2. Protestant Witnes.

2. Iohn of Beuerley, could not abide Monkes.

I answer. Iohn of Beuerley, is here put downe for
a Protestant, because he could not abide Monkes: and yet
many others being Monkes, are put with him in the selfe
same Centurie for very good Protestants. Now, if Iohn
of Beuerley, could not abide Monkes, how then could hee
abide Melitus the Monke, Coleman the Monke, and the
1100. Monks of Bangor here named? If Coleman, Melitus,
& these 1100. Monkes, were all Protestants (as M. Preston
supposeth them) then Iohn of Beuerley a Protestant,
could not abide Coleman, Melitus, and those other
1100. Protestants of Bangor. O banger of bangers!
if this be not a banger, then ether let me be banged
for abusing M. Preston, or he be begged for a &c.
Well saith the old Prouerb. *Oportet mendacem
esse memorem*, It is the fruit, it is the effect of lying.

A lyar

A lyar is often taken tardy in his owne tale. Leauē such men, if you loue your owne soule.

But not to let him so slip, here againe your selfe *M. Toby*, will be able to entrap and evidently discouer your old Matters dishonestie. For euen by the confession of *Beda* (*M. Prestons* pretended Protestant brother) you shall finde him false, not only in the point which here he presseth, but in many other besides, which plainly proueth that *John of Beuerley* could be no Protestant. Peruse then his booke cap. 2. and you shall there finde, that this holy man wrought a miracle, by making a dumbe man speake, that had neuer spoke, and this by making the signe of the Crosse vpon his tongue: beside, healing a grieuous soare which he had in his head.

Againe lib. 5. cap. 3. (quite contrary to *M. Preston* in the very point now in question) you shall finde, that he was so well affected to Religious persons, that he him selfe visited their Monasteries, went into their chambers, and wrought a strange miracle vpon a sick Religious, which lay before at the point of death.

And in the same booke ca. 4. hauing hallowed a Church, and an Earle requesting him to come and dine with him, so to visit his Lady who lay greuously sick, *The Bishop* refused his gentleness, saying, that of dutie he must returne, and got to the next Abbay. But at last, yealding to the Earle, he dined with him, and sent the Lady some of the holy water, which he had hallowed in dedication of

of the Church, commanding him that carried it, *so will her to drinke of it, and so washeth that part of her body therewith, where the grieve was most vehement.* Whereupon she was made as whole and sound, as she had neuer bene sick.

Loe, how manie points are here found to be practised by *Iohn of Beuerley*, contrary to the Religion of Protestants, as the working of sundry miracles, and that by making the signe of the Crosse, hallowing of Churches with holy water, commanding the drinking of it to receiue health, the washing of soares therewith, and a miracle wrought by meanes of it. But that which you are principally to marke in this place, is, his answer to the Earle, to wit, *that of dutie he must returne, to go to the next Abbay*, as also his going in person to a Monasterie, to cure a Religious, that lay euen at the point of death. How then (for Gods sake) is it true, that this *Iohn of Beuerley* could not abide Monkes, when he went into a Nunnes chamber? And refused so great a noble mans curtesie, to discharge his dutie to an Abbay of Monks? Or with what conscience, can he (who ought to be a teacher of truth) commit to writing so grosse an vntruth, and wherein euen his owne pretended Protestant brother *Beda*, doth confound him?

His 3. protestant witness.

3. *Melissus.*

As this is but one bare word, so could I answer it with only Mumme. Neuer would he
deale

deale thus, if he entended not to deceiue. Here therefore his owne scholler will take the deceitfull master tripping, and be able to discover his foule, false and fraudulent dealing. For *S. Bede* (one of *M. Prestons* pretend d Protestants) in his hist. of the Church of England lib. 1. cap. 29. saith of this *Melitus*, that he was an Abbot by profession, and sent from Rome by the Pope. And c. 2. he brought from him, *holie vessels, altar clothes, ornaments for the Churches, apparell also for the priests and cleargie, reliques of the holie Apostles and Martyrs, and the Popes Pall.*

And lib. 2. cap. 3. *Aug.* the Monke (who *M. Preston* saith peruerterd England) made this *Melitus* the first Bishop of London, anno 604. And lib. 2. cap. 4. He went againe to Rome to take counsell of Pope *Boniface* (another Pope) touching the gouernement of the English Church (a point which *M. Preston* hath sundry times opposed) And lib. 2. cap. 5. he said Masse. And cap. 7. he consecrated a chappell, which *K. Edbald* had built in honor of our Blessed Lady. And in the same cap. He succeeded *S. Aug.* (who peruerterd vs) in the see of Canterbury: where he wrought a strange miracle by quenching a raging fire which burnt and consumed the whole citie. And lastly, was canonized by the Pope for a Saint of his Church, as *God wine* confesseth in his life.

Loe, I pray, what two prettie Protestants *M. Preston* hath presented vs, in these his two last Centuries, *Melitus* and *Beda*, both Monkes of one
& the

& the same papisticali schoole! Euen now *Iohn of Beuerley*, a Protestant, could not abide Monks; and now to popish a Monke as *Melitus* was, and *Iohn of Beuerley*, ar here coupled together, for two most deare Protestant bretheren! Euen now, a King of England, is canonised for a Protestant, only for that he suffered not any of his subiects to goe to Rome (anno 1017.) and here one Protestant, alloweth well of anothers going thither, and that to aske counsell touching the gouernment of the English Church! Euen now they were reputed good Protestants, who hated the Masse, Reliques, and detested Rome: now *Melitus* saying Masse, going thither, and bringing with him into the English Church, a whole cart-loade of Romish ragges, is reputed still for a good Protestant, and to be of the selfe same Church and faith with all Protestants!

O miraculous muse! O mirror of Ministers! Who like another *Moyse*, taking a Papist by the tayle, can presently turne him into a Protestant! And taking a Protestant by the tayle, can as soone turne him into a Papist! Did euer Christian man, heare of such a chymera! What Diuel, (if he could get him out of hell) might not this cosoning Minister, crowde into his counterfet catalogue, that can thus enclose wi him one and the same Arke, all sorts, as well of vncleane, as cleane beasts! Iudge *M. Toby*, if one may not rightly iudge him crackt in his wits, who will crake thus; Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do?

His 4. Protestant Wines.

1100. Monkes of Bangor, not after the popish order, were miserably slaine, because they withstood the proceedings of Austen the Monke, sent from the Pope into England.

Answer. I confes it was a miserable thinge, that Austen a Monke, should cause the slaughter of so many Monkes. I grāt it likewise for a greate miserie, and a great maruell, that Pope Gregorie, who him selfe was a Monke, should become a man to butcher, or cause to be butchered, 1100. Monkes, all at a breakfast. Who if they had euery one a wife as he hath, what a wofull criē did their 1100. widdowes and children cast vp to heauen against the Pope? wherof I wonder M. Preston forgot to speake. But tell vs, M. Preston, ar your profelites men, or ar they beastes? Or haue you made a bargaine behind their backes, to sell to them, to wholoouer will buy thē, for very fooles? Or will they suffer you to expose them vpon euery forreine market place, to be flouted and houted at by all the world? If not, how shame you not so to abuse them as you do? First, by making them beleue, that these 1100. Monkes of Bangor, were so many Protestants, members of the same Church, and faith that you ar? And secondly, miserably slaine by Austen's meanes, because they withstode his wicked proceedings? for so you must needes suppose, if you will suppose ought to the purpose, of their being miserably

bly flaine, for withstanding *Austen*?

Sir, haue you not inserted *Beda* in this your catalogue, for an honest protestant? Well then, wil you stand to your owne word, and allow his testimonie and authoritie, touching the murdering of these 1100. Monkes? Then let all the world heare, how loud a lyar he maketh you to be, who yet do make him your Protestant brother, and a member of the same Church your selfe ar.

In his historie of the Church of England lib. 2. c. 2. doth he not tell you in plaine termes, that *S. Aug.* wrought a miracle vpon a blinde English man, to confound them for that they would not agree twith him (marke I pray you) in *Catholique vnitie*? Doth he not tell you in the same chapter, that, *the good man of God* (marke the praises your Protestant brother giues him, whom you say peruerterd vs) *threatningly prophesied*, (mark, for he makes him a prophet) *that if they would not accept of peace, and be accorded with their brethren, they should receiue and feelee, warre from their enemies. And if they would not preach to the Englishmen* (mark the wordes of your brother Protestant) *the way of life, they should suffer at their handes: and by their power, the vengeance of death. Which thing in all points came so to passe* (marke, for here againe he makes this peruerter a prophet) *as he foretold by the secret working of Gods iudgement* And at the end of the chapter, hauing told the maner how *S. Austens* prophesie came

to passe, he concludeth thus. *So in this maner was fulfilled (marke once againe) the prophecie of the holy Bishop Augustine, who was himselfe long before that, taken out of this life (mark what became of this peruerter in the end) to the Kingdome of heauen. And that (marke the praises of your 1100. Protestant Monkes, by your owne pretended Protestant brother) those vngracious and false people, suffered the punishment of temporall death, because they had refused and despised (mark) the wholsome counsell of perpetuall life and saluation offered vnto them.*

What say you now to this testimony, proceeding from the mouth of one of your owne so ancient a pretended Protestant brother? How shall men belecue you in your sermons and words, when you are found to be so false in your very writings? What vnt ruth will you not dare to tell out of your pulpit at home, that dare disperse such notorious vnt ruths abroad, euen into forreine contries? You haue here told vs much euil of *S. Aug.* as that he was the cause of the murder of those 1100. Monkes, and you adde immediatly after, that he brought in poperie, he did not conuert England, but did peruert it (surely all most haynous sinnes as euer could be committed.) Now we goe not here about to disproue you by the testimonies of approued Papists reiected by you, but by the prooffe of one of your owne pretended Protestant bretheren, of whom you confidently crack. *Here was our Church, and he professeth the same faith that we do, and yet we finde such*
strang

strang and wonderfull differences betwixt you, as truly were able to make a simple man out of his wits.

For your pretended Protestant brother tell vs, 1. that this murderer and peruerter (as you terme him) wrought a miracle in curing of a blind man. Now can men that peruert others, & draw them into grosse blindnes, restore sight vnto the blinde? how blinde are you to imagine this? 2. He calls him, *the good man of God*, S. Aug. Are murderers, are perverters from God, good men? are they of God? are they Saints? 3. He saith that he exhorted them to *preach to the Englishmen, the way of life*, but do murderers and perverters, preach, or exhort others to preach, the way of life? 4. He proues him a *Prophet*, and therefore calls him a *holy Bishop*. But do murderers & perverters, merit to be stiled Prophets & holy Bishops? 5. He saith he was *taken out of this life into the kingdome of heauen*: but are murderers and perverters of mens soules for their paines, taken out of this life into the kingdome of heauen? O heauens, what a heape of aburdities, hath M. Preston heaped together in this place! Who sees not the disloyaltie? Who sees not the treacherie? Who sees not the impudencie of Protestants, when they are put to proue the being of their poore, beggarly, and for-lorne Church before Luther?

The end of this 9. age.

To summe vp this 9. and last Centurie, consisting only of foure witnesses. 1. *Aydan*, and his

companions for abhorring the Popes pompe 2. *John of Bauerley* against Monkes. 3. *Melitus*, put in only to stop vp an empirie hole where he had nothing els to put. 4. And lastly, the 1000. Monkes of *Bangor*, miserably flaine, but he tells not for what. The points of religion being so few in number. The witnesses so falsly pretended to be Protestants, them selues being a l of them ether Monkes or Massing priests, and that after the Romish maner. None of them proued to defend the 39. English articles, you finde I dout not that to be true, which heretofore I so often told you, that Protestants neuer were in the world before *Luther*. That it was impossible searching all contries, citties, townes and parishs, to finde a Protestant before *Luther*; and that therefore *M. Preston* concludeih most impertinently, and most deceitfully, saying. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we doe?*

Yet as if the good man had gained the goale, he closeth vp his letter with this dilemma (as he supposeth) saying. *Thus we haue traced the footsteps of our Church and Religion, for a 1000. yeares before Luther: and this was before Poperie shewed it selfe in its colours. Now cease to demand where our Religion was before Luther. Austen the Monke brought in Poperie: he found true Religion here: He did not conuert England but did peruert it. M. Tobie, it is a false suggestion, which the Romanists buzze in to the eares of their profelites, that our Religion was not heard of before Luthers time, When we haue a cloude of witnesses*

nesses on our side.

I answer, that touching *S. Aug.* I refer you to that I haue already said of him. But touching the tracing of the footsteps of your Church and Religion, I know, we haue indeed traced them, and by the tracking, haue founde. *First*, sundry damned heretikes, as *Lollards*, *Wicklifs* and *Waldenses*. *Secondly*, traitors and conspirators, as *Sir Iohn Oldcastle*, and his companions. *Thirdly*, of the loathsome family of Loue, as *Gerardus* and *Dulcinus*. *Fourthly*, of the bonnie Religion of the Iewes and Turkes, as *Michael Balbus*. *Fifthly*, a companie of most exorbitant Raylers. *Sixtly* and lastly, a troupe of as ranke Papists as euer raigned: all which hath bene auerred and proued, for the most part, euen from the very testimonies of pretended Protestants them selues, which in all reason ought to make the proofes the more exempt from suspition.

Touching your aduise to *M. Tobie*, that he now cease to demand, where your Religion was before *Luther*, as though you had so fully satisfied, as it were a shame for any reasonable man, to aske the question any further, sir it is but a brag of a brasen face, yea contrariwise he hath more cause to doubt, and to insist more vpon the demand, then euer before: And for that you haue performed nothing lesse, then that which he and others, expected at your handes, I say vnto you as our Saviour said to that old deceiuer. *Tace, obmutesce Satana. Peace, peace M. Preston*, cease, cease to deceiue after so base and so grosse a fashion. Hide for shame, these

hicious Protestant diuels hornes, containd in this your counterfet Catalogue, before they peepe any further out of hell. As for M. Toby, I tell you plainly, you cannot now cosen him, you can neuer carry him away with such sordid trash: He is too too intelligent: and both he himselfe, with the assistance of his friendes, will be, (by Gods grace) alwaies able, to track the footsteps of your deceitfull and black Church, in the white & pure snowe of all sinceritie, as here in part hath bene performe: and the better to arme him against any ensuing and future deceits, I thinke it good here to discouer the manie defects of this your present counterfet Catalogue: which are as follow.

Of the defects of M. Prestons Protestant pretended Catalogue: and how he is to redresse the errors thereof, if he intend to returne an answer to this Examen.

1. **T**He first notable defect therof is, that it is composed of no lesse then of 30. particular witnesses, who exorbitantly railed, and rau'd at sundry Popes, the Sea of Rome, Monkes, Friars, and Religious persons. But this is, as if a Catholicke should scrape together into a Catalogue (to prooue the perpetuities of Papistrice) the names of those, who had bitterly and shamefully reuiled, and rau'd at Protestant Princes, at their Nobles and priuie Councell, or at their Archbishops, Bishops, and English Cleargie, as many
have

haue done, of whom I haue giuen examples in this discourse, and then conclude as *M. Preston* doth against Catholiques. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profest the same faith that we do.* Not points of rayling, but points of Religion are here to be handled.

2. The second notable defect is, that he raketh into it, the risse raffe & scumme, which the church of God, by her lawfull ecclesiasticall censures, hath cut off, and cast out from her, for their damned errors and heresies, how odious and loathsome soeuer the same be at this present, euen to Protestants. Examples are in the *Lollards*, *Wickliffists* and *Waldenses*, whose blasphemous heresies were so enormous; who should they preach them at this present day amongst our Protestants, themselves would condemne them to the fire. But this is iust as if a Papist, for want of better prooffe of his Churches perpetuities, should put downe for Papists, *Traske* the Iew, *Hacquet* hangd in in Cheapside, *Legat* the Arrian burnd in Smith field, and the like, neuer caring (as *M. Preston* doth not) what they held contrary vnto Catholiques, so they were mortall enemies, & ether put to death, or persecuted by Protestants. Catholiques scorne such knights of the post, and detest such dunghill witnesses, or to conclude from thence, as Master *Preston* doth. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profest the same faith we do.*

3. The third notable defect is, that he croudeth into his deformed Catalogue, such as in
more

more points agree with vs against them, then with them against vs. Example wherof are, in **William Taylor, Bertram** and others: which is to ioyne those together in vnitie of Church, who notoriously dissent and differ in matters of faith (an absurd coniunction.) For he that holdeth something with me, and something against me, cannot be said to be of my religion; yea, hence it would follow, that there was neuer in the world but one religiō, neuer in the world any heretick, nor could the faithles, be euer distinguished from the faithfull; for neuer was there heretick: held not somewhat with the truth. Hencefore is the Roman Church, greatly recommended; and contrarywise the Protestants as much to bee condemned, which in vnitie in faith, condemneth for heresy that dissent from her, although it be on point alone, *M. Preston*, drawing them into his Church notwithstanding some articles and points, wherein they disagree from, and therefore wrongfully concludeth: *These are not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we do.*

4. The fourth notable defect is, (and that a foule one) that he inserteth in his Catalogue, for perfect Protestants, such as were notorious known Papists, nor euer iustly suspected or tainted, for any one point of Protestantisme, vntil this our brazen-fac'd age: such for example were *Armaschanus, Theobald, Beda, Miletus*, the Monkes of *Bangor*,

Banger, with sundry of our Catholick Kinges. Which very point alone (if there were no more) apparantly bewrayeth, the most egregious beggarie and pouertie of Protestants, put to proue the continuance and perpetuities of their Church: and is iust as if we (for defect and want of other witnesses) should name to *M. Preston* for perfect good Papists, *Iohn Fox*, *Iohn Iewel*, *Sutcliffe*, *Bell*, and such other peeces, whom yet wee knewe in our very consciences, to be our deadly enemies, and to hate our religion to the pit of hell; and notwithstanding (as past all shame) conclude as *Preston* doth. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profest the same faith that we do.* The fifth notable defect is, that he maketh Protestants, for that, for which any simple man of the world, may claime and challenge them Catholiques (a great impertinencie.) Examples whereof are very plentiful. In his 1. Cent. numb. 6. *Iohn Goose*, burnd at Tower hill for the same (a right Goole nomine &c.) In his 4. Cent. numb. 6. *Petrus Bleffensis*, for exhorting the people to goe out of Babylon. In his 7. Cent. numb. 1. King *Alfred*, for causing the translation of the psalter into the English tongue. In his 8. Cent. numb. 3. *Beda* for the like occasion, only of translating *S. Iohns* gospel. From which slight and forrie proofes, a Roman Catholique would scorn to conclude as *M. Preston* doth. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profest the same faith that we do.*

more points agree with vs against them, then with them against vs. Example wherof are, in *William Taylor, Bertram* and others: which is to ioyne those together in vnitie of Church, who notoriously dissent and differ in matters of faith (an absurd coniunction.) For he that holdeth somthing with me, and somthing against me, cannot be said to be of my religion; yea, hence it would follow, that there was neuer in the world but one religiō, neuer in the world any heretick, nor could the faithles, be euer distinguished from the faithfull; for neuer was there heretick, which held not somewhat with the truth. Hence therefore is the Roman Church, greatly to be commended; and contrarywise the Protestant Church as much to bee condemned, which to preserve vnitie in faith, condemneth for hereticks those that dissent from her, although it be but in one point alone, *M. Preston*, drawing them greedily into his Church notwithstanding so many articles and points, wherein they disagree from him: and therefore wrongfully concludeth: *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we do.*

4. The fourth notable defect is, (and that a foule one) that he inserteth in his Catalogue, for perfect Protestants, such as were notorious known Papists, nor euer iustly suspected or tainted, for any one point of Protestantisme, vntil this our brazen-fac'd age: such for example were *Armaschanus, Theobald, Beda, Miletus*, the Monkes of
Banger,

Bangor, with sundry of our Catholick Kinges. Which very point alone (if there were no more) apparantly bewrayeth, the most egregious beggarie and pouertie of Protestants, put to proue the continuance and perpetuities of their Church: and is iust as if we (for defect and want of other witnesses) should name to M. Preston for perfect good Papists, *Iohn Fox*, *Iohn Iewel*, *Sutcliffe*, *Bell*, and such other peeces, whom yet wee knewe in our very consciences, to be our deadly enemies; and to hate our religion to the pit of hell; and notwithstanding (as past all shame) conclude as M. Preston doth *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we do.*

5. The first notable defect is, that he maketh many Protestants, for that, for which any simple man in the world, may claime and challenge them to be Catholiques (a great impertinencie.) Examples hereof are very plentiful. In his 1. Cent. numb. 6. *Iohn Goose*, burnd at Tower hill for the truth (a right Goole *nomine &c.*) In his 4. Cent. numb. 6. *Petrus Bleffensis*, for exhorting the people to goe out of Babylon. In his 7. Cent. numb. 1. King *Alfred*, for causing the translation of the psalter into the English tongue. In his 8. Cent. numb. 3. *Beda* for the like occasion, only of translating *S. Iohns* gospel. From which slight and forrie proofes, a Roman Catholique would scorne to conclude as M. Preston doth. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we do.*

6. The sixt notable defect is, that this his Catalogue is composed for the greater part, of base obscure, or ignorant persons, eminent, nether for learning, nor sanctitie of life (wherof there is such plentie amongst vs Papists) but rather of Saints euen raked out of hell it selfe: not one of M. Prestons Protestants to be found, so much as in any halfe penny Almanack, where yet the names of so many admirable Saints of sundry ages, ar recorded. And therefore cannot well conclude. *These Were not alone, here Was our Church, and they profess the same faith We do.*

7. The seauenth notable defect is, that he shames not sometimes most idly to set downe, only bare and emptie names, therby to stop vp (Tinkar-like) emptie holes, where he had nothing else in the world to put: neuer telling, nor speaking so much as one wise word, what they held, ether with him, or against vs. Examples whereof, are, in Richard Huerden, (a poore Wol-winder.) Cent. 1. numb. 8. and in Melitus the Monke, Cent. vlt. numb. 3. Where he might as well haue put downe Cato & Plato for Protestants, (who yet were Pagans). And consequently, cannot conclude vpon the producing of emptie names. *These Were not alone, here Was our Church, and they profess the same faith that We doe.*

8. The eight notable defect is, that where as most Protestants pretend, the Church of the first 5. or 6. hundred yeares, to be wholly theirs, and that

that since those dayes only vntil Luther, Papistrie to haue ouerwhelmed the truth, and oppressed Protestants, *M. Preston* wholly omitteth to proue, the being of his Protestant Church, in those her more pure and flourishing times, and which approached nerest to our Sauour him selfe and his Apostles her first founders: euen then (forsooth) when all were Protestants, and not a Papist to be found, but as rare to be seene, as a black Swāne. Because therefore, all the faithfull of those more pure and primitive times, were entirely Protestants, this his present Catalogue is iudged greatly defectiue, and it is exacted of *M. Preston*, that he ascend those more easie ages, and continue his Catalogue, thorough those other 6. or 7. more purer Centuries, so fertile and flourishing with famous Protestants; so to carrie his faith and pedigree a long, till he come and lay it downe at the feete of Christ, from whence he, and all Protestants, pretēd to haue first receiued it. Then may he braue a Papist to his face, and boldly say. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we do.*

9. Finally, because his whole Catalogue consisteth only of nine Centuries, (instead of 16. which he should haue gone thorough) I also will content my selfe, to discouer only nine defects thereof, to to end and iumpe with him iust in nūber (although I could discouer as many more) Which ninth therefore shall be in moode and figure, and is this that followeth.

Who-

Whosoever shall hold any doctrine, contrary to the 39. English Articles, agreed vpon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both prouinces, is not to bee accounted for a perfect and formall Protestant but standes *ipso facto*, excommunicated out of the present Protestant Church. But not one of those comprehended in *M. Prestons Catalogue*, but held some doctrine or other, contrary to these 39. English Articles. Ergo not one of them was a perfect and formall Protestant, but standes *ipso facto* excommunicated out of the present Protestant Church.

Now *M. Preston*, shew your selfe a tale man, and vntie for your life, this one knot. Which if you be notable to doe, then blame not *M. Tobie*, if he cease not still to demande: *Where your religion was before Luther*. Nor blame any Romanist if he buzze into his eares, that your religion was not heard of before Luther. And lastly cease to brag as you haue done, without all truth, reason, or honestie. *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the same faith that we do.*

Thus are we come to an end of what hath passed betwixt me and sundry persons, about this vsuall demand; *Where was your Church before Luther?* Namly, with *M. Lewis*, *M. Bouth*, *M. Louel*, *M. Tobie Methereell*, and *M. Larder*. We haue all answered, *M. Iohn Prestons* letter, against the Antiquitie of the Roman faith: and examined, and refuted, his pretended Catalogue of visible Protestant professors of his faith and Church before
Luther.

Luther. For the which, albeit we haue looked, as you see, thorough the whole number of *Nine hundred yeares*, yet finde we not, so much as one only Protestant in all those ages: and so, are nether solued in our doubt, nor satisfied in our demand. *Where was your Church before Luther?* But lest as far to seeke, as we were before. In which discourse, I doe confesse, I haue dealt a litle more harshly with *M. Preston*, then either my humor is, or then I haue done with other men; but, he must impute the fault to himselfe, and to his irritating, and pricking penne. Those who shall deale more candidly, and cedatly, then he hath done, shall finde me quite another man: and so shall he also, if he please to come on after a cooler manner, as schollars ought to do in so sacred a cause.

And now am I come to that discourse which was the cause, not only of vndertaking *Sir Hum-frie Lynde*, but also of ripping vp all the rest, which hitherto hath bene related: and which, I had verely thought, to haue suppress, let lie in the dust, and buried in the ashes of euerlasting obliuion; And this it was. It hapned, that one *Master Daniel Skinner* (a maruelous honest, vnderstanding, and faire conditioned man, now dwelling in *Calais*) coming to *Dunkerke*, and being in the company of an old acquaintance of his, *M. William Randall*, an inhabitant of that towne, and a most sincere, and virtuous Catholique; one, who hath suffered teauen yeares close imprisonment, in *Queene Elizabeths* dayes, for his Religion: one, who

who though but of litle learning, yet would poure out his blood by whole buckets, if need were, in defence of his faith; one, whose charitie to all sorts of distressed persons, to very heretikes themselves, is so notoriously knowen, that the same therof will live, after he is dead and rotten; in a word, in euery respect, a true Israelite, plaine, vpright, and moulded iust after the maner of those old ages, when men loued God much, and knew litle malice. This man I say, *M. Daniel Skinnar*, in familiar maner said thus vnto. Ah, old *William*, that I might be so happie as to see thee a Protestant and a member of our Church before thou dyest? To whom *M. Randall* thus replied. A member of your Church? He I trow were a madde man, that would goe out of the old, true and Catholique Church, to make himselfe a member of yours, which was no where extant in all the world before *Luther*. Proue the contrary of this, and as old as I am, I will become a member of your Church to morrow next.

To this *M. Skinnar* replye I, that he had neuer seene any argument brought by Catholiques against their Church, which had not bene learnedlie solued by those of their side. Adding, that he would faine see but one only point put downe in writing, which they would not soone shew to be silly, and insufficient. This, as I remember, was the discourse betwixt *M. Skinnar* and *M. Randall* for the letter it selfe written to me, I confes I did not keepe: Hereupon *M. Randall* wrote vnto me,
reque-

requesting me to send him somewhat in writing to let M. Skinner a worke about. I, to gratifie him, as my faithfull, old, and ancient friend, presently sent him this position, the same in substance, and almost verbatim, which was sent before to Master Boush, for the Minister of Marks to answer to.

Iesus Christ hauing promised to remayne with his Church, euen to the ending of the world (Mat. 28. 20.) And S. Paul (Ephes. 4. 11.) shewing after what manner, this promise aforesaid should be performed, saith. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors, and Doctors &c. to the building vp the body of Christ, vntill we meete all into the vnitie of faith. This presupposed, we require the confirmation and accomplishment of this promise, to be veresified in the Reformed Church, as she is separate and distinct from that of Rome: continued successiuelly from age to age, without interruption vnto vs: recounting orderly, the names, of some at least, of such their lawfull, apostolicall Pastors and Doctors, remayning in the confession of one and the same faith, vse and number of Sacraments, now taught, practised, and approued, by the present Reformed Church.

This being sent to Dunkirk to M. William Randall, the 2 of May 1629. and within a few dayes after, by him to M. Skinner, neuer had ether of vs, any newes therof, for many months. I wrote to M. Randall to vnderstand, if M. Skinner had replied therto? I wet to Calais about three months after, and from thence M. Skinner and I, both rode together to S. Omers, I looked by the way when

of his owne accord, he would haue taken some occasion to touch the matter : but not so much as a word was spoken. When I saw that, drawing somewhat nere vnto the towne, I inuited him to take a lodging that night with me : which he accepted very friendly, and vpon this occasion wee fell into discourse of Religion for a great while together, about the position deliuered to him, and some other points ; particularly about the *Churches erring*, wherof I shewed him the whole discourse in writing, which had passed betwixt me, and *M. Antonie Larder*, and wherto he had promised to answer, but neuer did; no more then him selfe did, or is able to doe to that demand. *Where was your Church before Luther?* This lying thus, a long time dead ; at last, *Master Randal* wrote vnto me, that *M. Skinnar* had bene at Dunkirk with him, and promised to returne an Answer to our demand. I no sooner heard of this, but within some two, or three dayes after, I saluted him with these frendly lines.

Very Kinde and Worthy Sir.

Hauiug so many months since, deliuered to *M. Randall* for you (and that, if I well remember the contents of his letter) at your owne request, a Catholique Position to be replied vnto, you, hauiug kept and suppress the same so many months together, without returning any Answer: my selfe, hauiug bene twice or thrice since in your company,

panie, and neuer giuing the least sillable of satisfaction, made me to thinke (to deale sincerely with you) that you had imparted the same to your Minister of *Mark*, or to some other French, or English Minister: who knowing the difficultie there was, to vntie that hard and troublesome knot, had prohibited you to engage your selfe any further in that affaire. But receiuing of late a letter from *M. Randall*, that you had bene with him at *Dunkerik*, and had promised a new to returne an Answer; this, both gaue me some hope, that I should at the last heare from you; and (the more to hasten the matter) moued me to addresse vnto you these few lines, as a messenger of my truest loue.

This I did, so much the rather, because in that short discourse my selfe haue since had with you, touching some other particular points, I found in you, that ripenesse of wit, waight of wordes, measure of wisdom, and maturitie of iudgment, as I confesse vnto you (and that in sinceritie of soule) you so drew my hart and affection to you, and so moued me to pittie your deceiued zeale, that many hundred times since, you haue runne in my minde, and in a maner made it restless with continuall care, how to bring to passe, and how to compasse your recouery. In so much, that sometimes I resolued with my selfe (setting all other worldly affaires whatsoeuer aside) purposely to reparaire vnto you, and particularly to pursue you, in imitation of him, who, leauing Nintie

nine sheepe in the desert, went looking after one alone. Yea, this in part, I put in practise, and performed: but alas, at that vnfortunat time, when that disastrous, and heauie newes of your dearest sonnes vntimely death, arriued to you; For then, came I of purpose to éter into discourse with you, and brought with me, such prouision, as was necessary for the scanning & examining of so weightie a cause; but retyred my selfe, without discovering so much vnto you, because I saw, the vnseasonableness of the time, and both your selfe, and your louing wife, so ouer loaden, and replenished with sorrow, for so great a losse.

Now therfore (beloued Sir) seeing you haue by the reiteration of a new and secondary promise, as it were by a new obligation, bound your selfe to goe forward in that busines, I haue, out of my true and sincere loue (moued therto, as I hope from heauē, for your greater good) addressed vnto you these few lines, to the end to incite and encourage you a new, after this happie enquire of Christian truth. The rather, for that the Argument and Position deliuered to you, compriteth in it, and is the complement, of many other obscure and difficult questions; and yet it selfe much more easie, and much more sensibly to be discerned, then many other particular controuersies. For that Position of the *Perpetuall* and neuer interrupted *Succession*, of true and lawfull Pastors in the Church of God, deriued from the primitive times vnto this present, is not of the nature, that

that sundry other intricate and curious questions of Religion are (too high and sublime, for comon capacities) but, as it is originally fetched from the sacred fountaine of Gods word, as touching the *Promise*, to wit, that he would remaine alwayes with his Church to the end of the world. *Mat. 28. 20.* so, as touching the *Performance*, it is a matter of fact, and cannot otherwise be verified vnto vs, then by the production and enumeration of such Apostolicall Pastors, as haue alwayes orderly, and vninterruptedly, succeeded one another in that faith and Religion, first preached vnto vs by Christ himselfe & his Apostles: which all late scattered, interrupted, pretended reformed companies vtterly wanting, it followeth, that no English, no Frenche, no Dutch, or other latent congregation in the whole world, being able to produce one Pastor, or so much as one silly Sheep, one Man, or so much as a Mouse, for a thousand yeares and vpwards, agreeing with them in the authorised and promulgated Articles, of their present French, or English faith, it followeth, I say, and plainly appeareth, to any one that hath but halfe an eye, ether, that for those thousand yeares and vpwards, Christ had no Church at all here on earth; or, that such, new, and interrupted late companies, are no other, then so many false, dissenting, disagreeing, and hereticall conuenticles.

It is an visuall Maxime, punctually practised in all estates, that none may intrude him selfe into a publique charge, without the *Sending* or leaue of

a lawfull Superior; For, if any one should take vpon him, the place of a Lieutenant, Iudge, or Lord Deputie for the Kinge, in steede of another established for the present, without letters Patents of his Maiestie, should he not be held guiltie of high treason? I trow yes. Now, we demand of Protestants, what authoritie they haue to preach, administer Sacraments, and exercise such other charges in the Church, as they do at this day? They (quite God wot, from the purpose) reply vnto vs, they come to Reforme vs, and preach vnto vs the pure truth. But, we reply againe to them. To come to Reforme: to preach the pure truth and gospel of Christ, is it to haue Authoritie to preach? Surely no, but rather a strange case, that wheras in a free and well ordered cittie, it is not lawfull to exercise *Chyrurgie*, *Shoomakery*, *Tinkery* and the like, without being first a sworne matter of the Trade, though the partie had more skill then all the Masters besides in the whole Cittie, yet Protestants, haue bene so bould, and so audacious, as to thrust themselues into Ecclesiasticall charges, yea, & which is yet more to be admired, to thrust ours, the right owners (lawfully Called and Sent therto) quite out of our owne Churches.

The incomparable worthies, and inuincible Pillars of the primitiue Church, *Tertullian*, *Optatus*, *S. Ierom*, *S. Austen*; and the Ancients, principally serued themselves of this sword & weapon of *Succession*, to acquire and wiane many glorious conquests, against all fauorits of any new,
and

and all infringers of the old and ancient faith of their predeceffors; Who tearmed such New comers; Schollars without a Master; Children without a Father; Monsters, prodigiously borne of them selues. Adding, that by this argument, all Heretiques were confounded, becaule neuer Heretique could shew his next predeceffor. In so much, that before they would once heare them, they would first know who *Sent* them. If they could not proue their lawfull *Sending*, they incontinently without more a doe, did quite discard & cassire them. Doubtes grounded herein from the very word of God, which often, yea infinitely inculcates this vnto vs euery where, as, *Exod. 3. 10.* the scripture saith that *Moyfes* was *Sent*. *Exod. 28.* *Aron* was *Sent*. *Leuiticus 8.* the Prophets were *Sent*. *Luc. 1.* *Iohn Baptist* was *Sent*. *Iohn 8. 12.* *Christ* him selfe was *Sent*. *Iohn 20. 21.* the Apostles were *Sent*: which *S. Paul* briefly and clearly summes vp together in few words *Rom. 10. 14.* saying. *How shall they inuocate, in Whom they haue not beleeued? Or how shall they beleeu him, Whom they haue not heard? And how shall they heare without a Preacher? But how shall they preach, vnles they be sent?* As if he should say. No Mission, no preacher. No preacher, no preaching. No preaching, no beleefe. No beleefe, no true calling vpon *Christ*: and consequently, from first to last, no saluation. So that want of *Succes*sion, doth necessarily infer, want of the true Church, want of true faith, want of true Pastors, and of all true Religion.

Trulie, the very nature of Christianitie is such, that the most speciall externe motiue vnto it, is, the certaine *Mission* of Christ from his Father; Of his Apostles from him; Of other Pastors successiue-ly from them, from generation, to generation, to the end of the world: which doubtles is the cause, why both Christ himselfe, and his Apostles, did first of all labour to cleare this point, according to that of S. Mathew (23.1.) saying. *Vpon the chaire of Moyses, haue sitten the Scribes and the Pharises: all things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, obserue yee and doe.* The principall, yea perhaps the sole erring of all deceiued soules, straying from the pure truth, to be, because they first seeke to know *what* they should belecue, before they know, or seeke to know, *whom* they should belecue. Where, according to that which I haue a litle before alleadged out of S. Paul (Rom. 10. 13. *How shall they inuocate in Whom they haue not beleueed? &c.*) it is most euident, that before we can well know, *what* we ought to belieue, we must first know *whom* we ought to belieue: like as it is far more easie, in a common wealth, to know, *who* is a true and lawfull Iudge, then it is to know, *what* is true and vpright iudgment: as Doctor Champney hath learnedly noted vpon this controuersie in his *vocation*.

You know (gentle Sir) hat the holie scripture forew rneeth in sundry places, that towards the later dayes, false Prophets shall come in the name of Christ, that were neuer *Sent*, and say vnto vs.

Lo here, lo there. Mat. 24. 5. 26. Yet although they come with Christ in their mouthes, we are warned by himselfe, not to heare them. You further know, that scripture assureth vs, that heresies must be (1. Cor. 11.) to the end that those which are proued, may be made manifest. Now put the case that a new heresie and neuer heard of, should arise at this day, and put all Protestants (being first in possession) out of doores; what were fittest? what were meetest for them to do to defend their right? Will you say, to wrastle with the by the word? So will they wrangle with you vntill domes day & neuer haue done, but still insift, that the word is for them. What briefer, what securer, or what better way, then to demand of such new Masters, *Whence they came? Who sent them?* Presse them to proue them selues to be those true and lawfull Pastors, which according to *Christ* and *S. Paul*, were to remayne in the Church to the end of the world. Not to dispute, not to tamper with them touching their *Doctrine*, but to question them for their *Calling, Sending, and Succeeding* one another: Gods word assuring vs, that none may take that honor to him selfe, vnles he be *Called of God* thereto, as Aron was; (Heb. 5. 4.) For, he that comes with a new, strange, none, or vnheard of *Mission*, without any more adoe, is iustly suspected to come with, a new, false, and hereticall *Profession*.

This *Succession* therefore, is the thing that is exacted at the handes of Protestants, that like as in the Genealogie of our Saviour, the Apostle set-
 teth

teth downe particularly, orderly, successiue, the names of those, who from *Abraham* to *Christ*, begat one another in matter of corporall generation, to proue thereby his true descent and progenie from that his parent: so are they to do the like, in the descent of Ecclesiasticall *Succession*, recounting those, who from the first to the last, orderly, successiue, and vnterruptedly, succeeded one another, from the first spirituall parent, vnto this present. This is the fearfull Lyon, which lyes in the way of Protestants, whō they dare not budge for feare of byting. This one question, is the conclusion of all contention of this kinde: how worthy therfore to be searched into? This is that we haue cryed out, and called to Protestants, for these fourscore, or hūdred yeares, euen til we are hoarse, but can heare no answer. This is that which *S. Austē* said, detained him in the Catholike Church. Grant vs *Succession* of true Pastors, from Christ to this present, we aske no more. Proue your selues to haue this, and we will neuer question your Religion about other particulars. If you deny this *Succession* of ours, and proue none of your owne, what else do you, what else seeke you, but the vtter decay & demolishment, both of our church, and yours also, leauing Christ no Church at all here on earth, which cannot subsist, without a visible *Succession* of Pastors and Professors, to continue in all ages, vntill the second comming of *Iesus Christ*: as the two texts of sacred Scripture which I haue sent you, do plainly proue.

The

The premisses considered, I both pray and beseech you, for the tender bowels of our Saviour *Iesus*: for the merits of his sacred wounds: for the effusion of his most precious blood: & for all the bitter paines that he endured for you, that you delay no longer this important affaire, but that seriously, sincerely, and speedely, you endeavour to performe what you haue promised. To which effect, I shall humbly pray, that the God of mercie and peace, may be with you, to inspire, direct, and illuminate your vnderstanding, truly to seeke him: seeking, may finde him: finding, may embrace him: embracing him, may be so vnited to the Church militant in this life, that you may be a glorified member of the Church triumphant in the next. Which he for his infinit mercie sake grant vnto you, *Amē.*
8. of Iuly 1630.

By him that loues your soule, as
dearly as his owne.

John Heigham.

To this long, and painfull discourse, to me to pen, what answer thinke you *M. Skinner* sent? Forsooth a short letter consisting only of these few lines, little or nothing to the purpose. The tenor was as hereafter followeth.

Lans

Laus Deo in Calais the 17. of
Iuly 1630.

M. Heigham, I receiued your letter, With your Proposition, by M. Pam, Which because I hope you Will be fully answered, by a litle booke I haue now come, I Will not trouble you With long discourse, and should haue bene sent you by this bearer my friend, M. Bateman, Who can tell you, I Was this morning With him at the ship to haue called for it, but the Master is gone early for Dunkerk, else it had come by him; but you may expect it Within a day or two. Which if it may do you some good to bring you back to our side, I shall be right glad, and do not wholly dispaire, in regard of your good nature and vnderstanding. I Wish you as much good as I can do to a friend, and leaue the rest to the secret Working of almightie God. I pray Sir, asist the bearer hereof, in anything he shall haue occasion there, and you shall command me in the like here, and assure your selfe I Will remayne.

You: louing friend to command.

Daniel Skyunner.

The Master of the ship being returned from Dunkerk to Calais; vpon the 24. of Iuly following, I receiued another letter from M. Skyunner, together with the promised booke, which he sent vnto me by M. William Bateman, who brought the

the former letter without the booke, albeit I neuer expected any booke, but to be answered by him selfe, or some other by pen and writing. I will first insert here the letter it selfe, that you may see how we are dealt withall, when we demand of them-, *Where Was your Church before Luther?* And then my Reply sent him presently vnto the same.

Good M. Heigham. I thanke you for the kindnes you shewed to this my frend, and in any the like occasion, you shall find me both ready and Willing. I doe now send you the booke I so long tould you of, wherein you shall finde one of your Propositions to me, the same made by a Iesuit to the Author; which I conceiue is fully answered, as likewise many other chiefe differences betwene vs. I desire in the reading of it, that it will please God to enlighten your vnderstanding. I cannot finde, but he hath dealt very honestly in his quotations. The profit by reading of it, must come from God, the Author of all good, who I hope will direct your hart to a right vnderstanding, for your soules good. I thanke you for your letters of the 18. of this present, and wish with a good hart the same to you, which you professe in your letters to me. And so with my best wishes, I end, and will rest.

Your assured frend to serue you
Daniel Skyenner.

Calais 24. of Iuly 1630.

My reply vnto this letter 6. of
August 1630.

Worthy

Worthy Sir, and truly beloued in our Lord, I haue receiued yours of the 24. of Iuly, which came not to my hands, vntill the third of August (being Saturday in the euening) your good friend and myne, *M. William Bateman*, the bearer hereof, tooke not his way thorough this towne, as he went vp into the contry, but carryed, both the letter, and the booke you sent me, along with him to *Lile*. Which I speake by the way, to purge my selfe, and to shew, that in an affaire of such importance, so highly concerning the glory of God, and our owne good, I would be lothe to be taxed of a backward slouth, or iustly incurre the note of a negligent. *Tarda molimina nescit Spiritus sancti gratia*, saith *S. Gregory*, God the holy Ghost, is no loue of delayes. That diuine and inspiring spirit, harbours gladlie in the hart of him, who hastens to him with a holie speede.

I confes vnto you. That I haue often heard tell of this Author, but neuer saw him vntill now. I confesse 2. that (pag. 2. of his epist. ded.) he hath vndertaken to answer the same propositiō in substance, disputed at this present betwixt you and me. I confes 3. that I haue receiued great profit by reading thereof, the which I doubt not but came from God: whom I humbly beought to direct my hart with a right vnderstanding, for both our goods; I confes 4. that (as concerning my selfe) he hath heard my prayer to my vspeakable comfort, for the which I render him infinite, humble, and obedient thanks, I confes 5. that thorough
the

the goodnes of the same God, thorough the light of this illuminating lampe, I haue detected in this Author, sundry cuning and subtile deceits, tergiversations, falsifications, corruptions, and contradictions.

And because the end of this enterprise may not be the sole seeking of a vaine victory, but the glory of God, and the euerlasting good of both our soules; If I couince not all this out of his owne booke; If I say, I couince him not of sundry deceits; If I couince him not of plaine tergiversation about that challenge; If I couince him not of falsification; If I couince him not of corruption; If I couince him not of contradiction; But principally (and wherto I binde my selfe to you for the present) if I couince not clearly, evidently, and vndeniably out of *Sr. Humfrey* himselfe, notwithstanding all his readings, notwithstanding all his sleights, and shew of learning, that he hath not performed the taske which he vnderooke, that he hath not satisfied the *Iesuits Challenge*, nor shewed the visibilitie of the Church of Protestants in the ages before *Luther*: nor so much as any man or mouse in all the world of the same Religion; If I shew not, that he hath as much wronged his owne profession, as any man that euer wrote; If I prone not out of himselfe, the Church of Rome, to be the confessed familie of *Iesus Christ*; If I couince not this out of him selfe, and out of his booke which you haue sent me, then do I promise in the presence of almightie God; in the presence of all
his

his B. Angells, in the presence of heaven, earth, and all good men, simply, sincerely and from my hart, to renounce at *Markes* or where you please, Masse and Martins, with the whole Corps of the Catholique Roman Religion. And there, publicly on Sunday next, or what other day you please to appoint, to performe all this in the face of the whole assembly and confraternitie. And yet further, to liue and die, and to be burnt all to ashes, in defence of the Protestant and Reformed faith. Conditionally that if I doe plainly, apparently, and vndeniably performe this on my part, which I haue promised, that then you relinquish your present Reformed Religion. and become a true Apostolique and Roman Catholique.

Now what can any man say more? what can you desire more at my hands, then here I promise of mine owne accord? I verely perswade my selfe thus of you, that what you haue done hitherto, you haue purely done for the glorie of God, for loue of the truth, and zeale to saue your owne and others soules; and hope you haue, the same charitable opinion also of me. Which presupposed, to ioyne issue, and to come to an actuall triall of the truth, repaire I hartely pray you vnto me, or send to me, to come to you (for I seeke no kind of vantage by the place) and I for my part, setting all other worldly affaires whatsoever aside, will presently repaire to you, and attend vpon you, that so, sincerely, plainly and impartially we may examine this controuersie. You cannot in curtesie;

lie: you cannot in Christianitie, refuse so iust and reasonable an offer, the accomplishmēt wherof, cannot but redound to the honor of God, to the disgracing of heresie, to the gayning and sauing the soules of many others, who happely depend vpon my coming to you, or yours to me. The very Angels in heauen will reioyce at that day, and we both entring together into one Church, shall haue cause to sing that ioyfull song. *Hac est dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus & latemur in ea.* This is our Lords day, let vs reioyce and be glad therein. Make me so happie for my paines, as to receiue a speedy ālswer from you, And so wishing to your soule as to myne owne, I commend you to his sweet mercy, who make vs both happie, in his heauenly Kingdome. Amen.

This 6. of Aug, 1630.

By him who is ready to giue his
blood, for the lone of your soule.

John Heigham.

Hereunto receiuing no answer, nor hearing any tydings, that this of myne was safely come vnto M. Skynners handes (resolved now to let the matter sleepe no lōger, but to know at lenght, *Where was your Church before Luther?*) I wrote vnto him againe within four dayes after; the contents wherof, were as follow.

Very kinde, and beloued Sir. I wrote vnto you

L

on

on Tuesday last being the feast of the *Transfiguration of our Lord*, and in the same, invited you, with as much affectuous earnestnes as I was able, to come to S. Omers, that we might examine the busines about the booke you set me of *Sir Humfrey Lyndes*, intituled *Via tuta*; or, to remoue all obstacles, offered you my seruice (if that offer were not accepted) to come in person to you at Calais. I had then read him wholly ouer once, and since haue read him the second time, and purpose to set vpon him againe the third, by Gods assistance. I had thought, that my affectuous writing, and prouoking you to prooffe and triall, would somewhat haue touched, and transfigured your hart; but you haue not hitherto so much as acknowledged the receit of myne, saue only by silence, which giues no whit of satisfaction.

My desire was, you should come to S. Omers, because of the commoditie this place affordeth, more then Calais, to examine the Authors which he hath cited: which I then accused him, (and do now againe) to haue abused and corrupted. A fault laid to his charge by a right learned writer of our side, now *six yeares* since, in a booke intituled, *A Reply for the Real presence*, In which he is clearly conuincd of *Twelue* corruptions, committed by him about a booke of *Bertrams*, and that as he chargeth him (pag. 30.) with *excessiue audacity*. You, in yours of the 24. of Iuly affirme, that you cannot finde, but that he hath dealt very honestly in his quotations. But this you cannot finde,

de, much lesse iudge, and goe vpon a certaine ground, vnlesse your selfe haue carefully compared them with the originalls, This haue I done in part, for your sake (as another before me hath also done) and both of vs putting him into his owne Ballance, his owne Authors holding the scales, finde performed in him, that which holie Scripture affirmeth of *Balthasar*, King of Babilō, (*Dan. 6. 25.*) Thou art weighed in the Ballances, and found too light: thy Kingdome shall be taken from thee. Gods truth can stande, though not vnderpropped by such rotten posts. He that once transgresseth the bonds of honestie in this kinde, he that once before is takē tardy, how shall we trust him another time? Lyes haue nothing to doe within these limites.

This therfore being a matter of fact, it is an easie thing too finde the truth; an easie thing to discouer falshood. It is but only to open the Authors. To reade him; and to reade them. Come therfore, I beseech you, and let your owne eyes beare you witnes. You shall see both these, as also the former, verified before your face. If you refuse to do this, send for me (as I said before) to come to you, to veresie out of his owne booke, his flight from the question, and his euident tergieruation from his vndertaken taske. If do not confound him in your presence, let me for euer, remayne confounded. Flinch not, I beseech you, nor yet goe back from the combat, which was a thing of your owne seeking, not of myne. You

cannot, you may not now do it without disparagement to your cause, whose credit will be much crackt, if now you recoyle. Satisfie therefore, I beseech you. Be no longer silent. Shew that you seeke God and his truth, in all sincerity of soule. I shall remayne in paine till you reply. The desire of sauing your soule, hath set myne all on fire with affection towards you; wherein I will burne, vntill I see vnto what end this worke will turne. Fare yee well in our *Sauour Iesus*, this 10. of August 1630. being the day wheron the blessed Martyr *S. Laurence*, was broyled.

By him that will not cease meane
while to pray for you.

John Heigham.

Now after such louing solicitation; after such serious inuitation; after such expresse prouocation; after such notorious taxation and accusation, about sundrie vnruths laid to the charge of *Sir Humfrey Lynde*, and his plaine Tergiuersation, and flight from the state of the question, what (for Gods sake) would you now thinke, so wise a man as *M. Skynner*, and so great a propugnator of the Protestant cause, would doe in this case? Would you not suppose? would you not perswade your selfe, that now both he him selfe, *M. Bouth*, *M. Louel*, *M. Larder*, *M. Parker*, and *M. Tobie Metherel*, had they notice hereof, would all bestir themsel.

ues, would trot a pace, and ride post to S. Omers, to see the issue of this triall? To examine these obiected falsifications, and flat Tergiuersation from the state of the question, *Where Was your Church before Luther?* Would not one thinke that they would all endeavour, but especially M. Skynner, who had so far engaged him selfe in this affaire, to defend Sir Humfries booke, to confute Iohn Heigham, to draw that old Papist to his side, and to force and compell him, according to promise, to goe to Marck? Nothing lesse; no such matter; he slinkes his head out of the collar, as all the rest had done before him: and to washe his handes of so foule a busines, the 10. of August, returnd this answer.

M. Heigham, I haue receiued your letter of the 6. of August, which came to my hands this morning. I perceiue also, that you haue receiued the booke I sent you, and taken the paines to reade it ouer. That in reading of it, you haue found the Authors cunning deceipts, tergiuersations, falsifications, corruptions, and grosse contradictions, of all which you promise to conuince him, else to become With vs, a Reformed Protestant, which I wish for your soules good. But I perceiue a contrarietie in your humor, not tending that way, but to a credulous opinion of your side.

And if his booke be (as you write) so full of errors, I pray quote them; or, if it can be answered, I should be very glad to see it; that Sir Humfrey, who I suppose yet liues, may see his errors; and by seeing them (if such) no doubt will be ashamed to haue published

such a worke, and happely may be drawen to your side, which without question, would be a great conquest to you.

My occasions at present, will not permit me to come to see you. Nether vpon this occasion, do I wishe you to take the paines, nor needles time, to come hither; for I see, nether shall I draw you to our side, nor I thinck you me to yours, I being as content of myne, as you of yours. It is God which can work in the hartts of men, both the Will and deed. Vnto whose blessed protection I commend you, and will euer rest.

Your louing friend to be
commanded.

Daniel Skynner.

Vpon the receit of this the 18. of August after,
I wrote to M. Skinner as ensuerh.

Very louing and beloued Sir. Because I wrote againe vnto you the selfe same day I had one from you, and heard nothing since of the receit therof, I would not ommit (according to my wonted diligence) to reply to this of yours, wherin, first, you take notice of my franck and free offer of my selfe, to become with you a Reformed Protestant: which you wishe for my soules good, but perceiue a contrarietie in my humor, not tending that way, but to a credulous opinion of myne owne side. But tell me, I beseeche you, sweete Sir; Can it be for my soules good, to belieue a Protestant, which
pretends

pretends to proue, the perpetuities of visible Protestant professors in all ages before *Luther*, and shewes the same no more then the man in the Moone? Doth the true humour of a Protestant tend this way, to beleue whatsoever vntruth is tould him in fauour of his Reformed faith, and both to stop his Eares, and to hide his Eyes, to see that which is plainly, evidently, and expressely offered to be shewed vnto him out of the originals them selues, what strange humour call we this? My humour, I confesse vnto you, tends not to that, but to a quite contrarie way. And touching a credulous opinion of myne owne side, (not grounded on reason) you plainly wrong me. My free offer to become yours, if you can shew me, *Where your Church was before Luther*, doth quite conuince you.

Where you say *secondly*, that, if this booke be (as I write) so full of errors, I pray you to quote them. I haue, I assure you, accomplished your request. I haue quoted them. But what is now next to be done? Will you examine them? Will you take the paines to confront & compare them? If not, to what purpose, do you require me to quote them? How vaine is my labour for to note the? Ether you will beleue myne Eyes, or your owne; or nether of both. If nether myne, nor yet your owne, what shall I then say vnto you, but as our Sauour him selfe said. Eyes you haue and see not: eares you haue and heare not, when you are asked; *Where was your Church before Luther?*

Where you say 3. *If it can be answered, I should be very glad to see it.* How can I, or any man else, beleue you herein? What hope, or what appa-
 rance is there, that you will rather looke into the
 Originals then, or confront or compare them
 then, than now? You haue not the Authors
 themselues. Buy them, I beleue you will not.
 I haue provided them for you, without your
 further expences. I inuite you to see them. I reder
 them to you. They ar within halfe a dayes iorney
 of you. If after all this you refuse so faire an offer,
 then Eyes you haue, and will not see. Eares you
 haue, and will not heare, when you are asked.
Where was your Church before Luther?

Where you say fourthly, that, *If Sir Humphries errors be such, no doubt he will be ashamed to haue published such a work, and happely may therby be drawn to your side, which without question will be a great conquest to you.* To this I answere; If you re-
 fuse to see: if you be ashamed of Sir Humphries er-
 rors, what hope haue I, that he who committed
 them, will euer be content to be shewed them?
 In those that long since were shewed him, what
 signe of amendement? And consequently, what
 hope, ether to draw him to our side, or get any
 conquest of him, more then of you? May he not
 pretend other occasions as well as you, and so refuse
 to returne an Answer? May he not say as well
 as you, that it is but *needles time*? That he is con-
 tent as well *with his Religion*, as I with myne?
 Which if he should, then must he be content
 I plainly

I plainly tell him as I do you; Eyes he hath and will not see. Eares he hath and will not heare, though we hallow in them as loud as we can, *Where Was your Church before Luther.*

Fiftly, I haue to do with you, not with Sir Humfrey (at least directly.) You, sent me this booke as a full satisfaction to this demand. *Where Was your Church before Luther ?* No full solution is found in Sir Humfrie to this demand. No solution, in all your letters, in a twelue months time. I am to taxe you, and not him (at least directly.) You ar to answer me, and not he; yet nether he, nor you, answer at all to my demand. *Where Was your Church before Luther ?* Wherto, vntil you make a fuller answer, you may be sure, that nether Papists mouthes will be stopped, nor Protestants consciences well satisfied, touching. *Where Was our Church before Luther ?*

This being said, permit me briefly to lay before you, the whole comportedment of this busines. 1. You were the first Chalerger: you the prouoker. 2. Your offer being accepted, and an Argument sent you, you tooke an intollerable time (fourteene months) to returne an answer. 3. In all this time you haue sent but few letters: and them also extorted frō you, & forced therto. 4. All of them short: only complementall: not one at all disputing the point, though oft prouoked. 5. After so long delay, you set another to answer for you; who yet replyes to another man, and not to me, nor answers the point. 6. Having
nothing

nothing to say, you sound a retreat, and so retyre your selfe, vtterly carelesse to enquire any further. Thus many defects haue you comitted in the carriage of this cōtrouerſie: Is this square dealing? Is this vpright, honest, and real proceeding? Is this to seeke truth in all sinceritie? To examine things with integritie? To compose things with Tranquillitie? To conclude things with Christian Charitie? Then let vs say, *a Diea* to all plaine, direct and vpright dealing in points of Religion.

Sir, you cannot deny but (besides what I wrote vnto you) that I gaue you a booke of Controuerſie to read, long before you gaue any to me. I put the case you had read it ouer, once, twise, thrice, as I haue done yours, diligently. You taxe it, as I do that you deliuered me, of flat falsifications, corruptions, contradictions, and tergiversation, quite and cleane from the state of the question. You admonish me therof. You chaleng me thereon. You offer to veresie the places before my face. You prepare the Authors. You inuite me to come. You offer to renounce your Religion and to be of myne, if you fayle to make good what you haue vndertaken. Heare now my answer to all this: mark how pithily, how reasonably, and how to the purpose I reply, and let this letter be read in all the reformed Churches amōg the brethren; as I am sure it should, had it bene myne.

M. Skinner, I haue receiued yours of the 6. of August. I perceiue you haue receiued the booke I gaue you, and taken the paines to read it ouer.

That

That in reading it, you haue found the Authors cunning deceits, tergiversations, falsifications, corruptions, and grosse contradictions: of all which you promise to convince him, else to become with vs a true Papist: Which I wishe for your soules good, but I perceiue a contrarietie in your humor, not tending that way, but to a credulous opinion of your owne side. And if his booke be (as you write) so full of errors, I pray quote the. Or, if it can be answered, I should be very glad to see it, that the Author, who I thinke yet liues, may see his errors: and by seeing them (if such) no doubt will be ashamed to haue published such a work: and happely may therby be drawen to your side; which without question, will bee a great conquest to you. My occasions, at present, will not permit me to come to see you: nether vpon this occasion do I wish you, to take the paines, nor needles time to come hither. For I see, nether shall I draw you to our side, nor I thinck, you me to yours; I being as confident of myne, as you of yours. It is God who can worke in the harts of men, both the will and the deed; Vnto whose blessed protection I commend you, and will euer rest.

I remit my selfe now to the iudgment of all indifferent and reasonable men, to your selfe *M. Skynner*, and to your Minister of *Marck*, if this be a reall, full, and sufficient answer. I remit my selfe to the iudgment of *M. Lewis*, *M. Boush*, *M. Louel*, *M. Parker*, *M. Toby Metherell*, and Master
Larder

Larder, and to the whole Senat of the Reformed Seniors, if this excuse me, or rather accuse me not as greatly defectiue in returning answer: Our very enemies we make our Iudges, saith the scripture (Deut. 32. 31. Wherefore to conclude if all these reasons alleadged by me, if all these forcible perswasions, will not moue you, nor make you speake after another maner, what can I do, but say with our Sauour. *Eyes they haue and see not. Eares they haue and heare not*, although we houte, we shoute, and hallow in them while our harts ake, *Where was Church before Luther?* If you haue ought to say, I pray reply. If nothing at all, then *M. Randal* and I are both quit, with sufficient credit about this Encountre. And so to sweet Iesus I commit you, This 18. of Aug. 1630.

Yours still to vndertake any
paines to assist you.

John Heigham.

Vpon the receit of this, two dayes after I receiued another from *M. Skinner*, which was the last that passed betwixt vs about this dispute. And this it was.

M. Heigham. I had well hoped, that the booke I sent you, would haue ended all further disputes betwixt vs; it being a real answer, to your proposition. You know I am no scholler: that is, sufficient. You could not expect any thing, as from my selfe. It is enough.

nough for me to haue proued what I promised, by another of our side, who hath quit himselfe so well, that I beleue it will trouble all your colledge to disproue him. How well you seeme to tax him with many falsities, will be time enough for me to beleue, when I see them. In the meane time this booke of Sir Humfreis, giues me the greatest satisfaction for that point, I euer yet receiued.

To come thither to confront the passages, would be no satisfaction to me, because I nether vnderstand Hebrew, Greeke, nor Latin. It is like Sir Humfrey took his quotations, out of printed bookes, and I do beleue his Protestation in the last page of his epistle. If he hath committed any willfull, or malicious error, he is a Deuil, and no man; Although I confesse, some of your side, be so vncharitable to vs, that you would make me beleue, we can nether speake, nor write truth.

Besides, Sir Humfrey writes, and others affirme, that your side doth vse to purge such Authors, that write not all Catholique, as you tearme it: And so, that which Sir Humfrey hath found in other bookes in England, may not be in yours, or to a contrary sence. That being, how can we be satisfied? But if reason might take place, you may verie well perceiue, that the faith and doctrine now professed in our Church of England, was first instituted by Christ and his Apostles; After was taught in your Church, continually vnto this age. What hath bene from time to time added by your side as new Articles of faith, I am not bound to beleue no, nor if an Angel from heauen did preach other then that taught by Christ, or contayned in the Scriptures, as mat-

ter of faith. I am sure, the first institution we retaine, which is prooffe sufficient, our Church was before Luther, and that was all I euer promised. Nether was I the first prouoker, as you write, but that being once propounded, I remember I said, I would do my endeuour to make it appeare; which now I haue done by Sir Humfreis booke. And if you will not be wilfully blind, you may see it, I pray God open your eyes.

And whereas you would remit your selfe to diuers you name, as Seniors of our Reformed Senar, I protest I haue not yet let one see your last letter, which is dated of the 18. of this present, this being Answer to it: but rather I wish to be iudged by those of your owne side, if without partiallitie, they would reade ouer that litle booke I sent you; wherein is sufficientlie proued the state of the question. And therefore am resoluèd, nether to trouble you, nor my selfe further about that point. If in any other thing I can do you any seruice, you may free-ly command him, who desires your saluation by Christ Iesus. Who I beseeche to bring you to the light of his truth. And so I rest. Callais 20. of August 1630.

Your louing friend to command.

Daniel Skynner.

Thus haue you seene the strong conceit Master Skinner hath of Sir Humfries Booke, intituled the *via Tuta*, which he hoped alone would haue composed all further disputes betwixt him and me. Holding

ding it for a *Reall answer*, to my Proposition (though *reallie* wanting nothing more then this *reallitie*.)
 Opining, that he hath *quitted* himselfe so well in this
cōbates, that it will trouble a whole Colledge to *dis-
 proue* him. Lastly, that it giues him the greatest *satis-
 factiō* (for where was your Church before Luther)
that euer yet he receiued. He brings withall, his
 reason for it; For that the *faith and doctrine* (for of
 the Doctors them selues, there is no newes) *now
 professed in the Church of England, was first institu-
 ted by Christ and his Apostles, and after taught in our
 (Catholique) Church continually, vntill this age.*
 Which very reason would this good man weigh
 with vpright *reason* as he ought, were surely suffi-
 cient, to end all further disputes betwixt vs two;
 yea betwixt all Protestāts, & all Papists whatsoe-
 uer. For that this real Answer, hath indeed really
 and quite vndone and spoild Sir *Humfrie Lynde*,
 and all other Protestants of his liuerie, yea, so far
 forth, that it ought in *reason*, to trouble all the Col-
 ledges in the kingdome: which therfore, if not
 to him, yet trulie to me, giues the greatest satis-
 faction my hart can wish, or imagine.

For if, as *M. Skinner* confesseth, the faith and
 doctrine, now profest in the Church of England,
 was first instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and
 after taught in our Church continuallie vnto this
 age, then must it needes follow, I say, out of this
 confession, that true faith and doctrine was conti-
 nuallie taught in our Church vnto this age. That
 our faith and doctrine, was, and is, the faith and
 doctrine

doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. Then must it needes follow, that our Professors and Teachers (ours, I say, and no others) were the true and only teachers of this doctrine. For how could true doctrine, teache it selfe, without true *Doctors*, or true *Teachers*? How could false *Doctors*, and false *Teachers*, teache the true doctrine and faith of Christ and his Apostles, in the Church for so many hundred ages together, and yet be still true *Treachers*, & they them selues the true Church? If they taught some things true, and some thinges false, then was not this the faith and doctrine of Christ and his Apostles; or, both false as well as true doctrine, was continually taught in the church of God; and only false teachers, and no true, the Sheapheards, Leaders, and Instructors, of the flock of Christ, and whole companie of the faithfull. O the force of truth, to extort truth, out of the mouthes of her very aduersaries! No Rack, no Torture so extorting, as is the Rack and Torture of thy truth! O my God, how am I bound vnto thee for thy goodnesse, that were I out of the *safe way*, euen those (whether ignorantlie or wilfullie, thou best knowest) them selues that walke cleane another way, yet send me directlie to the Church of Rome, as to an assured and *safe way*, for my saluation! Now followes my Answer to this last letter of *Master Skinner* vpon the morrow.

Kind Sir; I receiued yours of the 20. of this present, which was the amplest that euer I receiued from

from you, and wherein you have giuen me more
 satisfaction, then in any your former, in acknow-
 ledging you are no schollar, nor vnderstand either
 Hebrue, Greeke, or Latin; for verely I perswa-
 ded my selfe that you vnderstood, at least the La-
 tin, else neuer would I so oft haue inuited you to
 the comparing of the corruptiōs, that I discouered
 in *Sir Hūsfrey*. Hence forward therefore, I will desist
 to trouble you any further by writing letters; and
 for *Sir Humfrey*, whom you hould so vnanswera-
 ble a man, that it will trouble all our Colledge to
 disproue him, I suppose they are loth to foule their
 fingars with so weake an Aduersarie: and ere it
 be long, it is like you will see one of *Sir Humfreys*
 owne coate, vndertake to grapple with him, and
 to shew you, as cleare as the Sunne, that there is
 no such realitie in his Answer, as you imagine:
 that he hath performed nothing lesse, then the
 taske he vndertooke, but slonck away by plaine
 Tergiuersation, from the state of the question;
 which truly I wonder you could not discover of
 your selfe, in reading of him. He will be discou-
 red therefore to your hande, and his deceitfull
 sleights, will be shewed vnto you. Perhaps you
 will see them better then, than you doe now:
 which God, for his mercies sake, grant you may.
 Meane while, let me only craue, to remaine in
 your loue, and to be reputed him, who euer, in
 all occasions, you shall finde most ready to serue
 you. 21. of Aug. 1630.

John Heigham.

M

Having

Having ended with others, now am I, Sir *Humfrey*, to begin with you, and to talke with you about your *Via Tuta*, which hath occasioned and put me to this presēt paines. And although I haue hitherto, had to doe with other men, yet neuer haue I deuiated, or started far from your owne dore; harping still vpon the same string; and pressing, and vrging still the same point. *Where was your Church before Luther?* You haue leene what hath bene hitherto said against them; And haue, I hope obserued, at what disadvantage we stand, disputing this point with all Protestants. For, by reason of their comon inconstancie, we are forced, against our willes, to enter at least into three sundry *Wayes* of triall with them. Against those, who pretend their Church to haue bene *Inuisible* (as *M. Jewel*, and others) we are fayne to walke by *one Way*. Against those who pretend a perpetuall *visible Succession* of Protestant professors in all ages *distinct* from ours (as *M. Preston* doth) we are forced to walke with them by *another Way*. With you, we are constrained to walke by a *third Way*, by reason you haue excogitated a new cratchet, contrary to the other two, which is, to imagine your abortiue Church, to haue bene for many ages, lodged and harboured in the bosome of ours; Wherin you suppose two distinct and different Mothers, to owne, one and the same childe: which as it repugneth in naturall birth, so hope I, by Gods assistance, to proue the same to repugne, in this pretended spirituall birth,
of

of your Churches breeding and inuoluing in our Churches bosome. But to begin to grapple. You (like a valerous Knight) come on at first, verie brauely, slighting the cause, the quarell, and all those that shall encounter you. And therfore make your onset thus.

Sir Humfrey Epist Dedicat.

pag. 1.



IF for no other cause, yet for this alone, that the world may know it is no difficult matter for a meane lay-man to proue, the Ancient visibilic of the Protestant profession, I haue attempted to sende forth this Essay of my poore endeauours in this cause, being therunto prouoked by a Challenge sent vnto me by a Iesuit in these words. (viz) That Sir Humfrey, or his frendes, should proue out of some good Authors, that the Protestant Church, was in all ages visible especially in the ages before Luther.

A N S W E R.

1. Thus you come on, but we shall see in the end, how you come off. You vse big words in the beginning; *That the world many know.* You

would haue the *World*, belike, take notice, how worthely you acquit your selfe in this single combat. You haue not in my iudgment taken the wisest way to acquire this honor: which to haue wonne, you should haue published your work, not in the vulgar *English*, but in the *Latin* tongue, that so the learned of other nations might haue take notice of your exquisite & rare exploits. This had bene the waie to haue spread your fame, & to haue made your prouesse knowen to the *World*. I smel by this, you leuel at glorie; Doubtles the lookers on wil giue it you if you truly gaine it: but if you shoote nothing neere the marke, what will the *World* say of your vndertaking? what will become of the glorie you seeke? Then will be vered in you, that of the Prophet *Isay*. *Our Lord hath giuen commandement against Chanaan, to destroy the strong therof, and he said. Thou shalt adde no more to Glorie.*

2. You imagine it noe difficult matter, for a meane lay-man, to proue the *Ancient visibilitie of the Protestant profession* in all ages before *Luther*. You do well to set a good face, at least, vpon the matter. It shewes the confidence you haue, ether in your cause, or in your owne skill: but deceiue not your selfe: both will bee scand; both will be canuald ere we come to an end. Nay, let me aske you in this present place, before that we proceede any further. Did you weigh? did you consider? did you ponder well these words before you published them to the view of the *World*? Two things

(as it seemes to me) this promise of yours doth insinuar. The one, to shew, or proue the *visible Professors*. The other, the *visible Profession* of the Protestants (not the *Anciens*, but the *Recent*, for that the Challenge exa teth of you: viz, those that liued, immediatly in the ages before *Luther*.) Marke now how I put you to it at the first. I take *Profession* in this place, for the *Faith* which ether you, or your Church beleue:h (and so I suppose do you your selfe.) As for *Professors*, you nether haue, nor can shew vs any. *Profession*, without *Professors*, if euer you shew, I neuer will beleene *S. Paul* more, who assureth vs that, *Faith is an argument of things not appearing*. And how then, will you shew vs that which cannot be shewed? or make vs to see that which Scripture assures vs cannot be seene? But more of this, as we go forward on our way.

3. In a booke intituled, *True Relations*, set forth by A. C. in defence of M. Fisher, how many Answers of the learned of your side, haue bene examined about this verie point, and found defectiue? Namely, that of M. Bernard; That of M. Rogers; That of W. C. by way of Dialogue. The perpetuall visibilitie of the Church. *Luthers predecessors*. Doctor Whites Reply to M. Fisher. That of Doctor Featly. That of Doctor Vsher. And that intuled the *Protestant Calendar*. Besides that of M. Iohn Prestons, which my selfe haue examined in this present Treatise. Now, what apparance, to expect that from the *Schollar*, which the *Masters* them

selues, haue not beene able to performe? That a meane lay-man, should shew to the *World*, that thing to bee most easie, which euen to the best learned of the same Religion, hath of all other things, proued most insolluble and impossible: and which euen still to, this very present, doth more puzzel them, then whatsoeuer else, is by vs propounded to them? Well, the taske howsoeuer, you haue vndertaken, and shew it to the *World* you must, or shew vs your heeles (a disgracefull sight, to be shewed by a Knight) which is all, I feare, you will shew the *World*, instead of shewing vs. *Where was your Church before Luther?*

Sir Humfrey, epist. Ded. pag. 2.

It is not my profession, I must confesse, to reurne chalēges, or to publish Works of this nature, yet knowing that Truth is iustified of her children, I haue presumed as a childe of that Mother, to vindicat her cause, and maintaine my owne reputation.

A N S W E R.

4. That Truth is iustified of her children, is a truth. That your as a childe of truth, will appeare, if with truth you iustifie your Mothers cause; You, a meere secular Gentleman, haue vndertaken, to vindicat the same, and to maintaine your owne reputation, in a thing which you confesse not to belong to your profession, I, as meere a secular as your selfe,

selfe, seeing your bould and hardy offer, thought my selfe bound by your example, to do as much, in defence of my Mother, as you, offer to do in the defence of yours. I except your offer therefore. I take vp your gloue, and am ready to encounter and grapple with you vpon this occasion: alwayes provided, that you bee as good as your word: stand to your promise, and giue vs a Catalogue of the Names of Protestant professors before Luther, because Truth it selfe assureth vs, And hee gaue some Apostles, and some Prophetes, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue, vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11. This in my vnderstanding, you promise to performe. But how?

Sir Humfrey epist. Ded. pag. 2.

And in Answer hereunto, I shall present such proofes, as are warranted by certificat and confession, not only of the most orthodox Fathers, but of the Bishops, Doctors, Cardinalls, and other moderne writers of the Roman Church. And then pag. 5. you further adde. Of what strength and force is Truth, shall appeare by this, that she extorts a full and ample testimonie from her sworne enemies, to make good the visibilitie of our Church.

A N S W E R.

5. What (noble Knight) beate vs with our owne waapona? Will you extort from the testi-

M 4.

mony

mony of the *Ramish Bishops, Doctors and Cardinalls* (your sworne enimies) your visible Protestar professors before *Luther*? These are very big and blustering wordes: these are bould and hardy threatnings. If you euer performe this, then doubtles will you shew your selfe, the brauest Knight that euer yet put foote into the field. Then must the *Worlds* fame needes shew forth your noble Feates; and we decried for the basest Cowards, and veriest Crauants, that euer entred into combat. Marke well I pray you, your vndertaking: stand your ground: keepe your footing: proue out of vs, and from our confessions; *That the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in the ages before Luther.* Performe this, and then indeed you both vindicat your Mothers cause, and with all maintaine your owne reputation. But looke vnto it that you do this, elle both the Childe and the Mothers credit, will lie in the dust.

Sir Humfrey. Epist. Ded. pag. 3. 4.

It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ & his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible professors in all ages; It were therefore sufficient (without any further recitall of succeeding witnesses) to proue, that the now faith of the Church of England, is that faith, which was once deliuered to the Saints by Christ and his Apostles. But I rather cōdescend to meete the Aduersarie vpon his owne ground; and to deale with him at the same weapon
which

Which him selfe hath chosen: Wherein on our part, the Ancient Fathers shall be my Champions, and his owne Romish Bishops, Doctors, Cardinals and Scholemen, shall be my Seconds, as being Testes veritatis, Witnesses of Gods Truth professed in our Church. And pag. 9. you further confesse, that we Catholiques, call for a Catalogue of Names, of such Protestants as taught and professed in all ages, the 39. Articles of your Religion.

ANSWER.

6. Now I haue you, Sir Humfrey, where I would. Here must we looke vnto you, that you giue vs not the slip, nor goe not from vs. It were sufficient, you say, without any further recitall of succeeding Witnesses, to proue that the now faith of the Church of England, is that faith which was once deliuered to the Saints by Christ and his Apostles: but I rather condescend to meet with the Aduersarie vpon his owne ground, and to deale with him at the same weapons which him selfe hath chosen. Note I pray you your owne plaine, faire, and honest offer: you are to let the faith of the now Church of England alone; as also the faith deliuered to the Saints by Christ him selfe, and his Apostles, you are to speake of the visible Professors of your Church; not of their profession. You are to come to a particular recitall of succeeding Witnesses; not of that which they did teache or witnesse. In a word, to particularise their persons, not their profession. This is the true state of the question. This indeed is your Aduer.

Adversaries owne ground. This is his owne weapon; This Catalogue of names, is that we call for. *This* (to vse your owne words) *is acknowledged on both sides to be via Tuta.* The Certaine and Safe way. Meete with vs vpon this ground. Deale with vs at this weapon, lead vs into this Safe way, and we shall aske no more at your handes, but free lie confesse, you haue manfullie vindicated your Mothers cause, and withall maintained your owne reputation; wonne the honor of the daie from all the world; and that Truth is iustified of her Children, Truth himselfe hauing tould vs. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11.

Sir Humfrey epist. ded. pag. 5.

Of what strength and force is truth, shall appeare by this, that as she extorts a full and ample testimonie from her sworne enemies, to make good the visibilitie of our Church, and denies Antiquitie and vniuersalitie, to the principall Articles of the new Roman Creed; wherein she points forth that old and true way. And this is acknowledged on both sides to be via Tuta, The certaine and Safe way.

ANSWER.

7. I, Sir Humfrey, all is good, so you make this good. We shall neuer withstand the strenght and force of this truth, which you shall extort from
our

our owne testimonies, *to make good the visibilitie of your Church.* God forbid we should euer withstand so cleare a truth. But looke well, to your vndertaking. It must be *visibilitie*: not *faith*, not *profession* alone without *professors*, which is Inuisible. It must be *Yours*: not *Ours*. It must be a *Church*; which (as I conceiue) must consist of a company of men. Proue this: make this good out of our testimonies, *et eris mihi magnus Apollo*. And we will applaud you aboue all that euer yet tooke pen in hand. O, but you begin already to slide your head out of the collar, and to pay vs with a *Slip*, in steed of a *Shilling*: for thus you say immediately.

Sir Humfrey epist. ded. pag. 6.

Vpon Which ground, it is likewise lawfull for me. Talionis lege, to frame a Counterchallenge by demanding. By what authoritie of Scriptures and Ancient Fathers, they haue imposed new articles of Christian beliefe vpon Priests and people? *Sure I am, those (Twelue) new coyned Articles, declared by their Grand Councel of Trent, and published by Pope Pius the fourth, with streight charge to be receined of all men, vpon perill of saluation, are so far short from the knowledge of Antiquitie, that as yet they are scarce vnderstood amongst their owne Disciples for articles of faith. And their best learned, Romanists professe openly, that most of them were unknowne to former ages. It is no wonder then that a blinde obedience, and an implicit*
faith,

faith, is so much obtruded vpon the ignorant of the Roman Church, when their best learned Doctors are forced to confesse, touching the chiefe articles (wherein they differ from vs) that they can nether subsist by Antiquitie, nor stand with the sãstie of the beleener.

ANSWER.

8. Here, Sir Humfrey, you stand not your ground: you keepe not your footing: you flit, you fly from the state of the question. Your part is (for the present) not the *Offenciue*, but the *Defenciue* warre. Play your owne part: let ours alone. For suppose that, not only those Twelve Articles, but all the whole corps of the Roman Religio (wherein she differs from you) could *nether subsist by Antiquitie, nor stand with the sãstie of the beleener*, what is this to you? what followes, what will you inferre thereon? Will you infer thus? The Councell of Trent, or Pope Pius the fourth, hath imposed Twelve *new* and *false* Articles of belife vpon the priests and people of the Roman Religion: ergo all the Articles of the Protestant Religion, composed by the Parliament, are *old*, and *true*? Many points of papist Religion are vilerly false: ergo all points of Protestant Religion, are absolutely true? How followes this? or how can you infer thus? Surely no more then you may with honor argue thus. The Turkes and Iewes Religion, are both prophane, are both false: ergo, Protestant and Puritan Religion are both true. Is this your *via Tuta*? Is this

this the way to make the world to know, how easy a matter it is to stop a Papists mouth, asking of you. Where was your Church before Lusher? Is this to answer the Iesuits Challenge? Is this to vindicate your Mothers cause, and to maintaine your owne reputation? This, God wot, is poore stufte, & prouen to the world, that you medle with a matter, which indeed belongs not to your profession.

9. To make this manifest by another medium, marke how easilie I could retort almost euery syllable of this sillie deuise vpon your selfe. By what authoritie of Scriptures and Ancient Fathers, haue Protestants imposed new Articles of Christian beliefe vpon Priests and people? Sure I am, those Twelue (or rather 20.) new coyned Articles, declared by their grand councell of Parlament, and published by Edward the Sixt, and Q. Elizabeth, with streight charge to be receiued of all men vpon perill of saluation, and paine of excommunication, are so far short from the knowledge of Antiquitie, that as yet they are scarce vnderstood amongst their owne Disciples for Articles of faith. And their best learned Reformists professe openly, that most of them were vnknewen to former ages. It is no wonder then, that a blinde obedience, and an implicit faith, is so much obtruded vpon the ignorant of the English Church, when their best learned Doctors are forced to confesse, touching many chiefe articles, wherein they differ from vs, that they can neither subscrybe by Antiquitie, nor stand with the sастrie of the beleener. With all the rest that followes of that subiect, not a word whereof but I could retort them euery one vpon

vpon your selfe.

10. For prooffe hereof, I remit you in part, to that which hath already beene said pag. 30. of the notable diffention betwixt the Protestants and the Puritans, their byting, renting, and tearing one another with their very teeth. This, in good sooth, is to meete you indeed vpon your owne ground, to deale with you at your owne weapon: you meane while, not keeping your footing, but forsaking your owne ground, and seeking to set your foote vpon ours, for your safer standing, which yet as you see will not serue your turne. Off therefore *Sir Hamfrey* from ours: stand on your owne: let our Church, for the present (if you will) be supposed the worst in the world: to want Antiquitie, vniuersalitie, visibilitie, or what you will. Proue the visibilitie of your owne; Proue the perpetuities of your owne; Repeate your visible professors; Recite your succeeding witnesses; Giue vs the *Catalogue of names*, that we so often call for, that we may once know. *Where was your Church before Luther?* Whatsoeuer you tell vs besides this, is but to dallie, is but to delaie, is but to trifle away the time. *Vindicate your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation;* your *Catalogue, Sir Hamfrey*, come out with your *Catalogue. Truth is iustified by her children. Iustifie Truth*: shew your selfe to be a childe of Truth. Truth it self tells you this. *And he gaue some Apostles, & some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors &c.* to continue, vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. *Ephes. 4. 11.*

Sir

Sir Humfrey epist Ded. pag. 8.

Nether may it seeme strange, that these men should creat new Articles of faith, when as they dare alter, and detract from the Commandement of God; Witnesse their Decalogue, so often published by the Church of Rome (hereunto prefixed) wherein, not only the second Commandment is left out (as it is vsually in their psalters, and in diuers of their Catechismes) but the fourth Commandement touching the Sabbath day, is changed into these words. Remember to sanctifie the holy dayes. But as for those presumptuous innovations or peccadilloes, the recitall of them, I account a sufficient refutation.

A N S W E R.

II. *Satis pro imperio.* It is enough, if you, Sir Humfrey account it so. But why I pray comes this in halting here? Whats this to Answer our demand. Where was your Church before Luther? Braue man at armes, you stand not your ground; you keepe not your footing; you recoyle; you slide away; you begin already to shew vs your heeles. These ar not the weapons agreed vpon. Matters of Faith, should here be forgot, and matter of fact, bee only followed, Profession silenced, Professors only be produced. Fie, Sir Humfrey, you ar already fled the field: the state of the question is quite changed. To what purpose then shall wee proceed

proceed any further in this dispute? Shall we euer see you retorne againe? Surely no: it being the whole summe of your subtil deuise, vnperceptable to draw away the minde of your vnwarie Reader to another matter, and so to get you quite gone. Well, howsoeuer you stragle, or what fe-garies so euer you fetch, we must follow you; esse we shall haue so many brags and boasts, as a horses back will not be able to beare them.

12. First therefore, where you charge vs, that we alter and detract from the Commandements of God, leauing the second Cōmandement cleane out, I pray, *Sir Humphrey*, where finde you in the word of God, that (which you accuse vs to leaue out) to be called any where, *the second Commandement*? That, which followeth next by your account, *the third*, and so in order of the rest? Who made you a deuider of the ten Commandemēts? In scripture I am sure you finde not this diuision of your deuising. *Zuinglius*, a great pillar of your present Church, makes three Commandements of the first: by his account then there ar eleuen, at least. What say you to the doings of this diuider? If we *alter and detract*, how doth not he alter and adde to the very Commandements of God him selfe?

13. But to come yet nerer to you; how these ten Commandements, were placed in the two Tables, whether *four* in the former, and *six* in the later; or whether *three* in the one: and *seauen* in the other, is no where expressed in the word
of

of God, in so much that euen amongst the ancient Fathers of the primitive Church, there was diuerſitie of opinions about this point, yet all agree vpon ten Cōmandements; In particular, amongst others which might be named, *S. Augustine* maketh mention of this diuerſitie, giuerh his owne Iudgment thereon, and yeldeth the reason for his doings. I will relate his owne words, to see what you, (who pretend to bee so great a patron of Antiquitie) will say therto. Thus then at *S. Augustins* owne words. *Quest 71. sup. Exod.* vrged by *D. Bishop* against *D. Abbot* in answer to *M. Parkins* Reformed Catholique pag. 656.

14. *Quæritur decem præcepta legis quemadmodum diuidenda sunt &c.* It is questioned, how the ten Commandments ar to bee deuided. Whether there be four vnto that precept of the Sabbath, which appertaine to God: and the other be six which appertaine to man, the first whereof is, Honor thy father and they mother: or rather, whether those former bee three, and these later be leauen. Now, they who say the former be four, do diuide this which is said. Thou shalt haue no other Gods besides me, and make a precept of that. Thou shalt not make to thy selfe an Idol, and the rest, where ſaigned things ar forbidden to be worshiped. But they will haue this to be one. Thou shalt not couet thy neighbours wife. Thou shalt not couet thy neighbours goods, and the rest. They who teache the former to be but three, and the latter leauen, they will haue all to bee one, that is prescribed about the worshiping of one God,

that no other thing besides God, be worshipped for a God: and they doe deuide the latter, into two; that this. Thou shalt not couet thy neighbours wife, be one: and, Thou shalt not couet thy neighbours house, his seruant, his oxe, or asse, or any thing that is his, be another. (Marke now S. Aug. owne Iudgment vpon this matter.)

15. But it seemes to me more conuenient, that the former should be but three, and the later leauē. Because to them that doe more exactly looke into the matter, these precepts that appertaine to God, do seeme to insinuate the Blessed Trinitie. And in truth, this that is said. Thou shalt haue no other Gods besides me, the very same is more perfectly expounded, when faigned things are forbidden to be worshipped. Againe, the coueting of a mans wife, and the coueting of his goods, do very much differ in the nature of sinne; for the one belongeth to Lecherie, the other to Couetousnes. Besides, the word, Thou shalt not Couet, is twice repeated in the latter: to wit; Thou shalt not couet thy neighbours wife. Thou shalt not couet his goods: Which argueth, that God ment to make that, two Comandments, or else he would haue put the word Couet, but once, and haue linked all the rest to that; to wit, Thou shalt not couet thy neighbours wife, nor his house, nor his seruant, and so forth, ioyning all to one verbe, that did belong to one and the same Commandment.

16. Marke now, Sir Humfrey, into what a plunge, and pack of troubles you haue brought your selfe. See whom you oppose in opposing Papists,

Papists? If we alter and detract from the Commandments of God, leaving the second Commandment out, S. August. is as culpable herin as we, whom you cannot deny but we punctually follow in this our deuision. If this in vs, be a presumptuous inno-
uation: then is it so in S. Aug. If *A peccadilloe*, the bare recitall wherof you account a sufficient refuta-
tion, then haue you refuted S. Austen him selfe, who yet in his resolutions, was held for one of the soundest, and most iudicious Doctors that euer was in the Church of God. Who discusseth and that most accutely, the very difficultie that you propose. Who resolueth on our side, and against you, making of the *ninth* and *tenth* cōmandments *two*, which you make but *one*. Placeth *three* in the first table and *seauen* in the second (iust as we) not four in the first, and *six* in the secōd as you & yours please to place them. Adding, in expresse tearmes, that *it seemeth to him, more conuenient*.

17, Lastly, for all he saith, he confirmeth the same with sundry strong and learned reasons.
 1. That this deuision better insinuates the B. Tri-
 nitie. 2. That which you suppose for a second Commandement, is indeed none, but rather a
more perfect exposition of the former. 3. That the co-
 ueting of a mans wife, and of his goods, do very much differ in the nature of sinne. 4. That the word, *Thou shalt not conet*, is twice repeated: whence he learnedly gathereth, that God inten-
 ded to make two distinct Comandments of the ninth and tenth. Lets see now if *Sir Humfrie* can
 N 2 bring

bring better reason, and more substantiall, for his doings, then *S. Austen* hath done: and let others note in the meane space, his calumniation, both of him, and of vs, in affirming euery where, both in their sermons and printed bookes, that Catholiques leaue out the second Commandement.

18. Touching the other part of your obiection, it is indeed a meere peccadilloe: For I pray, what difference put you betwixt these two? *Remember that thou sanctifie the Sabbath day.* And this, *Remember to sanctifie the holy dayes?* Is not the *Sabbath day*, in your account, to be accounted *holie*? Or is there but one *Sabbath day* with you in a whole yeare? Or is there no holy day in all your English Church of commandment, besides the *Sabbath*? Lord how malice makes you ouer-shoot your selfe. Your will, out of doubt in this assertion, was to doe a great deale of hurt, but nether your force nor wit, are able so much as to hurt a flea. I pittie you *Sir Humfrey* who so poorely vindicate your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation, which both I feare will perish in this disputation.

Sir Humfrey Epist. ded. pag. 9.

In the meane time, those men, who call for a Catalogue of names of such Protestants as taught and professed in all ages, the 39. Articles of our Religion, recessed and maintayned by our Church, let them in euerie age produce one Ancient and Orthodox Father, who did teache and maintaine their twelue new Articles,

De

De fide (which they command vnder a curse, to be beleeued of all men) I say, let them produce but one in all ages for 1500. yeares after Christ, till the dayes of Luther, that taught and beleeued all their Twelve Articles de fide, as points of faith: and for that one good Authors sake, I will be so liberall, as to acknowledge their professors visible in all ages, I will say their Bishops, Cardinals, and Schoolmen, which haue witnessed the Antiquitie of our Doctrine were mistaken, and ought to be reformed by an Index Expurgatorius; I will testifie, that the Reformed Churches, are guiltie of Noueltie, and submit my obedience with an implicit faith, to the Roman Church.

ANSWER.

19. I, Sir Humfrey, this is that we call for: this Catalogue of Protestant Names, in the ages before Luther. This is that you haue promised, when will you performe your promise? Where, in all your booke shall we finde this list? Hath the printer by error, hauing reprinted your booke foure seuerall times, lest that so much desired Catalogue quite out? What wrong hath he done you? Did your selfe, foure times together, when you sent or carried your Copie to the presse, leaue only that quaternion amongst all the rest vnawares at home behinde you? Hasten back, returne to your studie; reuiew your papers; be sure you mend this fault, in the fift Edition. Put it in; leaue it not out; or neuer put it out more. If you doe, the World will say, that it is a more difficult matter for a meane

lay-man, to proue the Ancients visibilitie of your Protestants predecessors, then you imagined. That you haue neither vindicated your Mothers cause: nor yet main-
tained your owne reputation, otherwise then by
plaine Tergiuersation. Your Catalogue, Sir Hum-
frey, come out with your Catalogue, else a Twelue-
penny loafer will not stop the mouths of those
that still will cry. Where was your Church before
Luther? Truth is iustified of her children. Truth it
selfe then tells you. And he gaue some Apostles, and
some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other
some Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue, vntill we
meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11.

20. You would haue vs to produce one Ancient
and Orthodox Father in euery age, or but one in all ages
for 1500. yeares to proue our Twelue new Articles, and
for that one good Fathers sake, you will doe, I mar-
rie will you, great wonders. Well, suppose the
worst, suggest to a companie of deceived Prote-
stants, the grossest conceit you can deuise of the
Church of Rome: suppose shee cannot produ-
ce one Orthodox Father in euery age, nor so
much as one only in all ages: suppose I lay all this:
what ether followes, or what will you inferre
theron? Shee cannot, ergo you can? Shee is a false
Church, ergo yours is a true? Shees a strumper:
shee goes a whoring: shees a harlot and the like
(for all these speeches dipt in lie and gall you be-
stow vpon her for a gift) ergo your Mother is an
honest woman, an vntouched maide? Away, a-
way, Sir Humfrey with these fillie, poore, and de-
ceitfull

ceitfull sleights. Goe not about to gull vs thus. Give vs better satisfaction, make good ynto vs what you said, that it is no difficult matter, even for a meane lay-man, to proue the visibilitie of Protestant professors before Luther. Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue. Vindicate your Mothers cause and your owne separation. Leave this trifling. Leave this Tergiuersation. Truth is iustified of her children. Is she your Mother? Are you her sonne? Recount then the names of your Protestant bretheren in the ages before Luther: Repeate your visible professors. Recite your succeeding witnesses, sith truth it selfe so plainlie tells you. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue, vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11.

21 Put I pray your Sir Humfrey, once at my request, instead of our Twelve new supposed Articles (which yet haue in part bene already proued against M. Preston to be most anciēt & old) your 39. English articles in their place; and this done, then repeate every word of all that followes to the end (as I enformed you a litle before.) If you be not set fast in the myre, that all the horses in your stable are not able to pull you out: if your mouth be not quite stopt: if you be not as dumbe as a doore, then will I neuer goe to Church more. I say to you, as you to vs: I reply to you in your owne words; If you can produce but one Ancients and Orthodox Father in euery age: or but one in all ages,

for 1500. yeares, to proue all your 39. English articles, I will promise *ad amussim*, to doe as much as you promise to do for vs. Shame you not, blush you not, to vrge against vs such triniall stoffe, which by such an Assle and such a Dunse of our Religion, it so easilie returned backe and retorted vpon you.

22. You talke of our *blind obedience*, and of the *implicit faith of the ignorant of the Roman Church*; You pretend; you promise to produce a *Catalogue of the names of visible Protestant professors in all ages from Christ till Luther*; you doe it not, you cannot doe it, it neuer hath bene done by any of yours to this very day; none of yours hath yet shewed. *Where was your Church before Luther?* Yet all your Proselytes (I put you *Sir Humfrey* amongst them also) belieue, forsooth, by *blinde obedience*, by *implicit faith*, that you haue had such visible Fathers, such visible, Ancient and Orthodox professors in all ages, who yet you are no more able to shew, then the man in the Moone. Whether now are those of the Roman, or those of the English Church, the more *ignorant*? Whether more led by *blinde obedience*? Whether more depending on *implicit faith*? The Angell in the Apocalips is said to weepe, becaule none could be found in heauen or earth that was able to open the booke. Surely *Sir Humfrey* heauen and earth weepe at this day, to see that booke once opened, wherein may be found the *Catalogue of Names of Protestant professors*; Stay our weeping, wipe away our teares,

reares, pittie our complaints: your *Catalogue Sir Humfrey*, nothing but your *Catalogue* will stop our mouthes, no other dugg will still our crying, no other cradle will euer rock the restless Romish children a sleepe, till you plainlie tell vs, *Where was your Church before Luther?*

23. But you will say, perhaps, I haue not proued all this while, that the Church can create or declare new articles of faith. True, I haue not, but if I supposed it would be pleasing to you; I dout not but it may bee easilie proued; To make a triall. Ether the Apostles, and the Pastors of the Church in the first age after Christ, had power to decree and promulgate that for an Article of faith which was none before, and to binde the Christian people to hould it for such, or they had not. If they had not; then farwell to sundry Articles of faith, decreed and promulgated by the Apostles themselves. If they had; then tell me why the Church of God, hath not the same authoritie now, that she had then? Againe; If the Church can decree and promulgate no new Article of faith, how hath you Church latelie decreed in your 39. English Articles, (namely Art. 22. & 37. *under a curse to be beleued of all men*, as well as we) these ensuing Articles? That there is no Purgatorie, no worship of Images; no Inuocation of Saints; and that the Kings Maiestie is head of the Church in all Ecclesiasticall or Ciuill causes? I hope you will not say, that Nero, and those other wicked tyrants, were heads of the Church by Gods appointment in the
primi-

primitive times, for so should he and the Apostles, haue set the W olues to keepe the Sheepe. There were no such decrees as these in the primitive times: if there were, produce them to vs, produce but one Author in al ages for 1500. yeares after Christ, till the dayes of Luther, and for that one good Authors sake, I will be as liberall to you euery way, as you are to vs. If you cannot doe this, then must it needes followe, that the Church hath power to decree and promulgate new Articles of faith. But what haue I to doe to proue ought? You are to proue, and not I. Post vs off no longer; produce your Protestant professors before Luther, repeat the names of your witnesses, recount the names of your Pastors, before the fall of that Apostat. Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue. Which vntill you deliuer vs, nether will Protestants consciences be euer satisfied, nor Papists mouthes be euer stopped, to aske of you. *Whete was your Church before Luther? Truth is iustified of her children. Vindicate your Mothers cause and your owne reputation; He that is the way, the truth, and the life, hath could vs out of his word. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue, vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephel. 4. 11.*

Sir Humfrey Epist. Ded. pag. 11

And as touching my owne particular. I professe thorough the prouocation of a Lesuite, I haue vn-
wil-

willingly thrust my Sickle into other mens Harvest, yet witnesse a true confession before God and man, that I haue nether wilfully, nor wittingly, falsified any one Author, either in Citation, or Translation in this Treatise. If any slips haue hapned (which I doe confesse for want of helpe and opportunity may befall me) let it be shewed me by answer moderately, plainly and faithfully, and I will ingeniously confesse the weaknesse, not of our doctrine, but of my owne handling. So for this time, vntill it please God to giue oportunitie to publish some further fruits of my labours in this kind, I hartely desire good interpretation, and fauorable acceptance of the beginnings and endeauours of him, who is.

At your seruice in Christ,
and for his Truth.

H. L.

A N S W E R

24. Sir, what Authors you haue wilfully or wittingly falsified in this your Treatise, it shall be time enough to tell you, when I come to speak thereof, in the place designed for their discoverie. Meane while, what say you to those laid to your charge by J. O. Author of the Plea for the Realpresence? Whole third Point, hath this for Title. That Sir humfrey in his Translation, hath most grossly corrupted the Booke of Bertram. And pag. 30. convinceth you of Twelve particular falsifications committed by you (as he saith) with excessive audacity,

ie; assigning the Reader to the lease, page, and line where he shall finde them euery one.

25. But because many honest meaning men, such as *M. Skinner*, and the like, do beleue the *protestation* made in this your Epistle, censuring vs *vncharitable*, because we suggest that Protestants can hardly *speake or write truth* (pag. 8c.) Tel me, *Sir Humfrey*, ar you guiltie of these alone, yea, or no? Is this the first time you haue beene tould, the first time you haue offended and bene taken tardy in this kinde? Surely no, for you haue bene accused by another of this wicked cryme, in another booke particularly addressed to your selfe by name; intituled, *A defence of the Appendix*, written by *L. D. to the Right Worshipfull Sir Humfrey Lynde*. Wherin Sect. 7. pag. 41. he chargeth you, *frantdelently* to haue *foisted* certaine words into a sentence of *S. Austins* concerning *free Will*. Sect. 8. pag. 42. to haue *falsly alleadged S. Cyprian*, about the argument of the Real Presence. Sect. 9. pag. 49. to haue *falsly alleadged S. Austin*. Sect 10. pag. 53. to haue *falsly alleadged S. Ambrose*. Sect. 11. pag. 55. to haue *falsly alleadged S. Hierom*. And Sect. 12. pag. 58. to haue done the like both with *Tertullian & Gelasius*, all about the selfe same argument of the Real presence. Charging you in expresse tearmes, (pag. 47.) that you goe about to *stop*, yea, that you seeke to *smother the breath* of thole Ancient Fathers, to compell them to speake as you would haue them.

26. You tell vs here, and make vs beleue,
that

that if any such slips can be shewed you by Answer, moderately, plainly, and faithfully, you will ingeniously confesse your fault. These Twelve by I. O. as also those other by L. D. (not slips, but most notorious and foule falls) were shewed you by Answer, moderately, plainly, and faithfully now Six yeares since. Where, all this while, haue you ether cleared your selfe, or ingeniously confest your fault, plainly and faithfully as you were tould it? What say you? What answer make you for your selfe? Was not the rearme of Six whole yeares, time enough to confesse your fault, after an humble, plaine and faithfull mane?

27. Truly this alone makes me suspect, that your owne conscience doth accuse you, and that you know your fault to be so foule, and as so greatly ashamed therof, that like to many naughty Catholiques, when they haue fallen into some grosse and capitall cryme, and haue beene tould therof, once, twice, and more often by their ghostly Father, at last, resolved not to amend themselves, but to lose the raynes to their wicked libertie, they presently runne to your Religion, vtterly fly all Confession before man, and haue recourse to that made only vnto God alone. Euen so you; who, what true Confession of all these faultes you haue made to God, I cannot tell, but for any true Confession you made therof to man, I confesse vnto you (although I haue enquired for it) yet neuer could I heare of any: Only L. D. telleth vs a trick you haue found to salue the matter;

matter, behould it here in his owne words pag. 5. *They haue printed against vs, and haue renewed an old decree against our printing: if no reply should bee made, some of them would thinke, that now they might lye by Proclamation. What greater signe of falshood, then hauing told your owne tale, to seeke to stop the mowthes of your Aduersaries?*

28. Hence are to bee gathered and obserued sundry thinges for their instruction, who are abused by your Protestation of sincere proceeding.

1. That this is nether the first time, nor the second that you haue beene taken tardy with this foule and enormous fault.
2. That this Protestation of witnessing *a true confessiō before God and man*, and, *nether wilfully, nor wittingly falsified any one Author, ether in citation, or translation*, to be but only a few good words, fraudeently so to take possession of your Readers Eare: a litle honnie rubd about the brimmes of the cup, so to make your Patient, the better to swallow downe at a draught, your deadly poyson.
3. *M. Skynner, M. Tobie*, and others may obserue, that we do not censure so vncharitably without iust cause, by the computation of those which haue beene formerly laid to *M. Prestons* charge, within the limits of one only letter, amounting to no lesse then 40. in number, besides those laid by whole hundreds to the charge of others; all which haue bene long since brought to account against *M. Iewel*, and other prime Protestants, and the score neuer quitted to this present.
4. Both they, and I do all expect, that you, and

M.

M. Preston, do purge your selues. He, of those he stands charged with in his letter. You, of those already objected against you by the two Authors a forenamed, as also of these which hereafter shall be objected in this Treatise: and that without delaying the matter so long as you haue hitherto done. Do you promise, in the word of a Knight, to performe this? If not, then assure your selfe the old prouerb will be verified in you, which saith. *Qui tacet consentire videtur*, Your very silence will make vs to say of you, that, *Qui semel reuocanda fines est transgressus, ipsum grauius oportet esse impudentem*. He that once transgresseth the bounds of shame, commonly after growes shamelesse, saith the prouerb.

29. I shall, I assure you, in this examination, lay to your charge sundry abuses of this kinde. I shall charge you, both with falsifying your Authors intencion, as also his very words by your corrupt translation, yea, even the sacred text it selfe: which I cannot see how you can excuse from evidently witting, or willfull falsification. You must not now thinke to excuse the matter by pretending *want of helpe and oportunitie*, this being the fourth seuerall Edition of your booke, reviewed by your selfe, the Author therof. I will therefore lay them before you, moderately, plainly, and faithfully; *Truth is iustified of her Childre. Vindicat your Mothers cause, and your owne Reputation*, otherw ise as M. Skynner doth witnesse of you, you are a Diuel, and not a Man, nor worthy to witnesse

nessle any confessiō about these sacred affaires. And now to goe forward.

Sir Humfrey pag. 30.

30. Having ended your Epistle Dedicatorie, you next come in with, *The new Creed of the Church of Rome*, as you please to call it, Adding thus for a marginall note. *This Creed is added to the Nicen Creed, and prescribed by Pope Pius the fourth, to be received with an oath, as the true Catholique faith: Which according to the forme of the Apostles Creed, may be distinguished into these Twelve Articles: and then you set downe the Twelve supposed new Articles, declared by the grand Council of Trent.*

A N S W E R.

31. Touching the pretended novelty of these 12. Articles, declared by the great Council of Trent, I remit you for the present to my Reply to *M. Preston*, where all those Articles, or the most of them, are already shewed to his confusion (and consequently vnto yours) to haue beene declared for Articles of faith, many hundred yeares before the Councell of Trent. Lo how soone, *Sir Humfrey*, you forget your selfe? How soone you break your promise of *witnessing a true confession before God and man?* Who shame not to publish to the world, and that in print, that these Twelve Articles, were, *so far short from the knowledge of Antiquitie, that as yet they are scarce vnderstood amongst their owne Disciples for Articles of faith.* And their best learned Romanists professe openly, that most of them were vnknownen to former ages. Epist ded. pag.

7. Is this your *Via Tuta*, to publish to the world such palpable vntruths? Is this kinde of proceeding the best meanes you haue, to vindicate your Mothers Cause, & your owne Reputation? Is this to witness a true confession before God and man? Nothing lesse, but a false foundation laid in the beginning, only to get the better credit with the simple, as I hope to shew you afterwards.

32. To come therefore to this supposed new Creed of the Church of Rome, receiued with an oath, and commanded vnder a curse to be beleued of all men. What say you first to a number of your Thirty nine new English Articles, and prescribed by Q. Elizabeth, and K. James. Do not your Minilters receiue them solemnlie with an oth? Are they not commanded vnder a curse to be belieued of all men, as articles of faith? If you can deny this, then heare what your owne English Canons say; and first in these expresse words Canon 3.

33. Whosoever shall hereafter affirme, that the Church of England by law established vnder the Kings Maestie, is not a true and an Apostolical Church, teaching and maintayning the doctrine of the Apostles: let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored but only by the Archbishop after his repentance, and publique reuocation of this his wicked error.

34. Againe, Whosoever shall hereafter affirme, that any of the 39. articles agreed vpon by the Archbishops, & Bishops of both prouinces, and the whole cleargie in the Conuocation holden at London, in the yeare of our Lord 1562. for the auoyding of the diuersities of opi-

nions, and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance, and publique renouation of such his wicked error. Can. 5.

34. Againe; Whosoever shall hereafter seperate themselves from the Communion of Saints, as it is approued by the Apostles rules in the Church of England, and combine themselves in a new brotherhood, accounting the^e Christians, who are conformable to the Doctrine, Government, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church of England, to be prophane, and vnmeet for them to ioine with in Christian profession; let them be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored but by the Archbishop, after their repentance and publique renouatioⁿ of such their wicked errors? Can. 9.

36. Now Sir Humfrey, tell me I pray you, wherein consists the disparitie betwixt thole of ours, and these of yours, supposing it for true (though most vntrue) that these Twelve Articles, were neuer known to the learned of our owne Church, before Luther? Ours, were decreed by the great Council of Trent, about anno 1564. vnder Pope Pius the fourth: yours, at two seuerall Conuocations, in the yeares of our Lord 1562. and 1564. vnder Q. Elizabeth, iust in the selfe same yeare that ours were. Ours is added (say you) to the Nicen Creed, so is yours. Ours, is receined with an oath, to be

be the true Catholique & Apostolique faith: so is *yours*. *Ours*, is commanded vnder a curse, to be beleueed of all men: and so is *yours*; vnlesse you imagin that a Christian may be cut off and excommunicated from the body of Christ, cast out of the Church and Communion of Saints, and yet be subiect to no curse; *Iam sumus ergo pares*, and you *Sir Humfrey* may put vp your pipes, and blush to bring such triuall stuffe, which so easilie is rerorted vpon your selfe, and banded back into your owne bosome by so fillie a Buzzard as my selfe. Is this your *via Tuta*? Is this to vindicate your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation? Is this to witnesse a true confession before God and man? verely no, but to expole, both her, and your selfe, to publike scorne and diffamation.

37. But to proceed; What is this to our maine question? *Where was your Church before Luther?* To what end all this trifling, all this dallying, losse of time, and tergiversation? Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue. That *via Tuta*, which we haue so long looked for of visible Protestant professors in all ages, especially in those before Luther. This was the Challenge: this the demand, made vnto you by the Iesuit. How do you accomplish this? How, or where, performe you this vndertaken taske? Your Booke intituled *The Safe Way*, assures vs you were put vnto it, to produce a Catalogue of mens Names. You vaunt in the very begining, that you will make the world to know, that it is no difficult matter for a meane Lay-

man, to proue the *Ancient visibilitie* of the Protestants profession. Where, I pray, are those visible Protestant professors to be found, in the whole Tract of your *via Tuta*, or *Safe Way*? What Way, or on whether hande shall we take, to meete with one of them in our Way? Is it a *Safe Way*, to lend one that had lost a Needle, to seeke the same in a botle of hay, where he may sooner loose his eyes with seeking, then finde the Needle, with all his peeping? What a *Safe Way* call you this? Your Treatise, which was composed ex professo, to answer this point; to vindicat your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation, consisteth of 18. severall Sections; in neuer an one of these Sections, can I finde the thing we seeke for, and which with such great facilitie you pretend to shew vs, *Where was your Church before Luther*? I will therefore to begin (not entring as yet into your Booke it selfe) take a short reuiew of the severall heades of eache Section, that so the world may see, what small hope or apparance there is, of the performance of your promise.

The 1. Section.

The causeles bitterness of the Church of Rome, against the Reformed Churches.

A N S W E R.

Well, to begin, let this be given you of grace. What infer you thereupon? Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther. What congruence? What consequence? What coherence?

The 2. Section.

The occasion of the cōtention betwixt the Churches, originally proceeded from the Romanists.

ANSWER.

Well, let this be as freely granted as the former (although most false.) What infer you thereupon? *Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* Lo then another like to yours. The occasion of the contention betwixt Eve and the Serpent, originally proceeded from the woman. Ergo she had a company of children before she had Cain. For truth, and forme, iust like to yours.

The 3. Section.

Corruptions, both in Faith and Maners, confessed by the members of the Roman Church, and yet the Reformation denied by the Pope, and why.

ANSWER.

Well, let this also of grace be granted to you, although as false as was the former; What infer you thereupon? *Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* *Nihil ad Rhombum.* Nothing lesse. You should much pleasure vs if you would once answer to the point pertinently. But along to the next.

The 4. Section.

Many learned Romanists convicted by the evidence of truth, ether in part, or in whole, haue renounced Poperie before their death.

ANSWER.

Well, let this be granted (though plentie of examples, plaine experience, your owne penall lawes to suppress vs, and the daylie apprehending of new Conuertits, turned from Protestants vnto Papists, ouidently conuince the contrarie) what infer you therupon? *Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* This agrees together, as harpe and harrow. But let vs follow you to the fift.

The 5. Section.

Worldly policie and profit, hinders the Reformation of such things, which are altogether inexcusable in them selues.

ANSWER.

Admit it doth. Meane you in *your* owne Religion, or in *ours*? But let me still be liberall to you. Suppose in *ours*. What infer you therupon? *Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* Lo then an other like to yours. Worldlie policie and profit, by pilling and polling of poore Catholiques, hinders the Reformation of such things, which are altogether inexcusable in them selues. Ergo there were such visible Protestant pillers and powlers in all ages, especially in those before *Luther*: which yet no historie, no Chronicle, nor complaint of ether side, makes mention of. But lets see, what you say in the sixt.

The

The 6. Section.

The common pretence of our Aduersaries refusing Reformation, because we cannot assigne the precise Time when errors came in, refuted.

ANSWER.

To be as free vnto you as before, let this also of grace be granted to you; What infer you therupon? *Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther? Well shot, Sir Humfrey.* In what mode and figure of all the Ninteene, doth this conclude? Lets set on the seauenth.

The 7. Section.

The pedigree of the Romish faith, drawen from the ancient heretiques; and the Protestant faith deriued from Christ and his Apostles.

ANSWER.

Here, *Sir Humfrey* (hit you right) you hit the nayle vpon the head. But contrariwise, you haue disgraced your selfe: you haue quite yndone your selfe in this Section, as the Reader will soone perceiue, if he doe but carefully marke your cariage: where six seuerall times at least, you conclude thus of vs. *Here is the Romish succession, both in Doctrine and Person.* And as often of your owne, thus. *Here was our Protestant Doctrine.* But tell me now. Had you a *Doctrine*, deriued from Christ and his Apostles, without any *Doctors*? Had you a *Faith*, had you a *Professiō*, without any *Faithful* to professe it? Fie, *Sir Humfrey*, you haue shamed your selfe, vnles

you plaister this in some other place. But let vs onward to the eight.

The 8. Section.

The testimonie of our Aduersaries touching the Antiquitie and Vniuersallitie of the Protestant faith in generall.

A N S W E R.

This is as frivolous as the former; For in all this Section, you name sundry points of faith professed, but none, but only Papistes, professors of them. Nor do you this orderly from age to age. We call for the *visible Professors* of the Protestant faith in all ages before *Luther*: not for the visible professors of our owne (wherof, what is he that dares to dout?) Can you not distinguish betwixt Professors, and their Profession? Betwixt the faithfull, and their faith? Or can you hence conclude, *Ergo the Protestants Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* Nothing therefore being in this, lets see if ought be in the next.

The 9. Section.

The Testimonies of our Aduersaries touching the Protestant, and the Roman faith, in these particular paragraphes. 1. Iustification by faith only. 2. The Sacrament of Baptisme, and the Lords supper. 3. Transubstantiation. 4. Privat Masse. 5. Seauen Sacraments. 6. Communion in both kinds. 7. Prayer and Seruice in the Latin tongue. 8. Worship of Images. 9. Indulgences.

A N S W E R.

This is still the same stuffe, only turnd the inside, out. The same dishe, only drest after another fashion. We aske for your *visible professors in all ages*, *especiallie in those before Luther*: : and you poppe vs in the mouth, with *Your faith*, and *Our professors*. Can you finde, both *persons*, and *faith*, in our profession: and *faith*, without *persons* in your owne? What a strange and chymericall faith call you this? We haue kept you company hitherto, to see if ether you conclude as you ought, or, according to promise answer the Challenge. You haue yet done nether. But let vs a lōg til we come to the end of the other halfe of this crabbed way, to see if we can once finde. *Where was your Church before Luther?*

The 10. Section.

The testimonies of our aduersaries, touching the infallible certaintie of the Protestant faith, and the uncertaintie of the Romish.

A N S W E R.

When will you make an end of this Cuckoes song? We call for a *Catalogue* of your *Professors*: not for prooffe of your *Profession*. We demand the *names* of your *faithfull*: we exact no account as yet at all of your *faith*. Were they men, or were they *Pharie ghosts*? If they were men? They were, as I wot, of the posteritie of Adam: particular, singular, and indiuiduall persons,

sons. What a doe make you then, before you name vs only one Professor of yours, *especiallie in the ages before Luther?*

The 11. Section.

The testimonies of our Aduersaries, touching the greater safetie, comfort, and benefit of the soule, in the Protestant faith, then in the Romish.

A N S W E R.

In the third page of your booke, you bring in your aduerfaries, houlding you for *heretiques, bel-bounds of Zuinglius, Luthers Whelps, Turkish Hugenotes, damned persons, and worse then Infidels.* Here you bring their testimonies to the quite contrarie, to wit, for greater safetie, comfort, and benefit of soule in your Religion, then in their owne. In whither of these shall we beleue you? How I pray hangs this together? Or how doth it follow? *Ergo the Protestants Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* Assuredly no more then this. The Sunne shines to day at six a clock. Ergo to morrow will be the first of September.

The 12. Section.

Our Aduersaries conuinc'd by euident testimonies of the Ancient Fathers, ether ridiculously elude them, or plainly reiect them.

A N S W E R.

You, and yours, reiect all the Fathers of these last thousand yeares. We both admit them, and defend

defend them against you. How senseles then, and ridiculous, is this Assertion? But say we did; yet hitherto haue we nether eluded nor reiected, so much as any one by name, whom you haue tendered to vs, for an absolute Protestant in all points; especially in the Ages before Luther. Would God you would once answer to the purpose.

The 13. Section.

Our Aduersaries conuincd of a bad cause, and an euill conscience, by razing of our Records, and clipping their owne Authors tongues.

A N S W E R.

Strange it were you should haue any Records, who neuer had so much as one Recorder. Can one raze those Records which neuer were? Name vnto vs those Protestāt Records of yours, which we haue razed: the author of them: the yeare, and the place they were printed in. If you nether haue, nor can do this, what strange whirly-gigs haue you in your heads, to conclude from hence. Ergo the Protestants Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?

The 14. Section.

Our Aduersaries conuincd of their defence of a desperat cause, by their blasphemous exception against Scripture it selfe.

A N S W E R.

These Sir Humfrey, are only words, to captiuat the grace, and to currie fauor with your Profelites.

tes. But what infer you therupon? Papists blasphemously except against the scriptures. *Ergo the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther.* How long expect we a Premises that thus concludeth? Which tell we haue, agrees together like as this. Sir Humfrey sent his man to New-market of an errād. *Ergo the Moone is made of a greene Cheefe.*

The 15. Section.

Our chiefest Aduersarie, Cardinall Bellarmine, testifies the truth of our doctrine, in the principall points of controuersie betwixt vs.

A N S W E R.

Suppose he did, what infer you therupon? *Ergo he testifies, that the Protestants Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther?* If Protestants will admit such inferences vpon the premises, then let them also admit this. London stands vpon the riuer of Themes. Therfore the Weather-cock stands West vpon the toppe of S. Toulies.

The 16. Section.

Our Aduersaries obiection, drawn from the testimonie of pretended Martyrs of their religion, answered.

A N S W E R.

Well, what answer make you to this weightie obiection? Can you hence argue thus? The Papists haue all the holy Martyrs to stand for them. *Ergo the Protestants Church was in all ages visible, especially*

Or, the Truly Safe way. 219

especially in those before Luther? Iust as this. Iohn Fox a preacher, wrote a huge booke of English Martyrs. Ergo Iohn Cox a Fisher, caught a Huge company of Kenish Mussels.

The 17. Section.

Our Adversaries common obiection, drawen from the charitable opinion of Protestants, touching the saluation of professed Romanists, living and dying in their Church, answered.

A N S W E R.

It is not your answer only that we expect, but your Inference: but your closing with the Iesuits Challenge, to prove that the Protestants Church was in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther: else you do but argue thus. Protestants have a charitable opinion of the saluation of professed Romanists, living and dying in their Church. Ergo Sir Humfreys Horse would eate no Oates, but dye for griefe.

The 18. Section.

Proving (according to the Title of the Booke) by the confession of all sides, that the Protestants Religion is Safer, because in all Positive points of Doctrine, the Romanists them selues agree with vs, but in their addition, they stand single by them selues.

A N S W E R.

I had thought you would haue once concluded according to the Iesuits Challenge. Which because you doe not, agrees with your vndertaking,
iust

iust as Germans lips , nine myles a sunder. But I disproue the principall part of your assertion, thus. To produce visible professors, of the present Protestant faith in all ages before *Luther*, is a Positive point of Doctrine . But Catholiques deny , that any Protestant euer hath , or is euer able to produce a Catalogue, of any such visible professors. Ergo Catholiques and Protestants agree not together in all positive points of doctrine.

38. Thus are we come to an end of all your Eighteen seuerall Sections, and finde not in them all, or in so much as one of them, one only Conclusion, answerable to the point, to the premises, to the state of the question, and vndertaken promise . Perhaps you will say , that in this short reuiew made of your Sections, I do but gibe and iest with you. I can not deny it: a sober and graue discourse, beleeues this subiect . But for excuse of my follie, I answer thus ; Doe you not seeme plainly to gibe and iest with vs, and not only with vs, but to flout and mock , euen Protestants also, to their owne face? What is to gibe? What is to iest? What is flatly to mock men to their owne faces , if this be not? What may the world say vnto you , who make it *no difficult matter* for a *meane lay-man*, to proue the *Ancient visibilitie* of Protestant profession in all ages before *Luther*? Who pretend to Answer the *Iesuits Challenge*, particularly about this point? Who vndertake to vindicate your *Mothers cause* , and to maintaine your owne reputation? Who promise to present such proofes,

as are warranted both by the orthodox Fathers, and moderne Writers of the Roman Church? Who so boldly condescend, to meete the aduersariē vpon his owne ground, and to deale with him at the same weapons which him selfe had chosen? Who threaten to extort a full and ample testimonie from your sworn enemies, to make good the visibilitie of your Church? Who cōfesse that we call vpon you for a Catalogue of Names, and in 18. whole Sections, neuer name vs so much as one Protestant in a thousand yeares before Luther? who haue written a whole booke, to Answer one only demand, and from one end to the other, neuer come neere it, neuer talke of it, neuer touch it with your litle finger? Who braue poore Papists with making of a new Creed: with admission of new Articles (neuer in the Word of God:) with blinde Obedience, implicit faith, and the like, and yet your selues make poore soules of your profession belieue for an Article of faith, that you had visible professors in all ages before Luther, and cannot shew so much as one in any age for a thousand or twelue hundred yeares together? What new Creed call you this? What new Article call you this? What follie, what frenzie, to taske other with blind Obedience, and implicit Faith, and to belieue such a blind bable, such a fond fable, which nether Papist, nor Protestant, nor Puritan, no Christian of what Religion soeuer, no Turke, no Iew, nor Saracin, is able to shew?

39. The palpable defectiuenes therfore of performing your promise preconsidered, to what purpose

pose should I wade any further into the bulke of your booke, wherof the very heads and arguments of the Chapters or Sections, doe tell me before hand, that to looke therein to finde, *Where your Church was before Luther*, is to loose my labour; is to looke for the falling of the Skie, that we may catch Larkes: is to looke when two Sundayes shall fall in one weeke: is to looke when the Man in the Moone will come vnto vs with the bushe at his back, to make vs a fire to warme vs with all in the depth of winter, when wanting both wood and coale, we are most a cold. Notwithstanding, your deceiued friends suppose that you haue fully answered the Iesuits demand. That you haue acquitted your selfe so well, that it will trouble all our collidge to disproue you. That this your booke, hath giuen them the greatest satisfaction in that point, that euer yet they received.

40. But here I aske him (and whom soeuer else, yea, euen the man him selfe that made the same) where is this full Answer, to be found? In what Section? In what page? In what paragraphe? in what line? In what part or parcell, of all the Booke? Is it possible, that any man of vnderstanding, should so much wrong his owne wit? Is it possible, that such an emptie blast, should blinde a cleare and open eye? Is it possible, that such an emptie buzze, should stop an intelligent and vnderstanding eare? Why then let Protestants propose to their credulous profelites, what they please, let them perswade them, that there were

innumerable numbers of such as themselves, in all ages, and in all Kingdomes, Contries and Places, in Italie, in Germanie, in Hungarie, Spaine, France, England, Scotland, Ireland, Moravia, Sclavonia, Denmark, Bohemia, Noruegia, Poland, Suede, and in the East and West Indies; let all the reasons in the world, both by word and writing, be brought by Papists to the contrary; let all the Records in the world be reuolued; let all kind of Histories and Chronicles be reuiewed, if ether they be resolu'd to hould as true as gospell, what is tould them, or become so obdurat and peruerse, that nether sence, nor reason, can preuayle with them, how shall we hinder them to crake, that they haue fully *answered the Iesuits Challeng?* That you haue acquitted your selfe so well, that it will trouble all our Colledge to disproue you? That your booke, hath giuen them the greatest satisfaction in that point, that euer yet they receiued? How, I say, shall not this be supposed an *answer* good enough, to send any foolish Papist in the world away with a flea in his eare? O true (or, rather false, *via Tuta!* O safe, (or rather Sandy) *Way!* O senselesse Galatians; who hath bewitched you (Galat. 3. 1.) to beleeue, that there were any Protestant professors in heauen, earth, or hell, before *Luther*, which neuer Saint in heauen saw, neuer man in earth saw, nor deuill in hell saw, before he saw *Luther!*

41. I said a little before, *Sir Humfrey*, that becaule not one of al your 18. Sections; becaule not in any contexture of so many Arguments and

Titles, you do not satisfie the demand which was made vnto you, nor deliuer the *Catalogue* of Protestant *names* which is exacted of you, that it was needles, and to no purpose, to wade any further into the bulke of your booke ; For, albeit in regard of it selfe, it deserueth for the small substance that is in it, rather to be contemned, then refused (and which I verily suppose was the cause, that there being so many learned men as there are of his coate that sent you the *Challenge*, none in so long a time returned answer) yet, well acquainted with the itching humor and pride of Protestants, their over-valuing of their owne wits, and their vnder-valuing of all other mens workes, though, I say, not for your bookes sake, yet for their soules sake, whom I so much tendre, will I briefly runne it ouer; especially to make good vnto M. *Daniel Skinner*, and other my much respected Protestant friends before named, certaine particulars, which by letters that passed betwixt vs, I laid vnto your charge, concerning certaine *corruptions, falsifications, tergiversations, and contradictions*, comitted by you in this your booke; which when I shall haue laid before, both them and you, I will expect the iudgment of the indifferent Reader, how far vnworthy and vnfitting it is, to entitle the same by the name of *via Tuta*, or *The Safe Way*; which rather deserueth to be entituled; *via Tartaria*, then *via Tuta*, rather the high way to *hel*, then the safe way to *heauen*, had it such a Title, as of right and truth appertaineth to it. And now

Or, the Truly Safe way. 225
to enter into the first Step, or Section of your
Safe way.

Section I.



*He causelesse bitternesse of the Church
of Rome, against the Reformed Churches.*

A N S W E R.

By the Title (*Sir Humfrey*) of this first Section, you seeme to insinuat two severall things. The one, to iustifie the quarrell of other Reformed Churches, besides your owne. The other, that you would haue the Church of Rome, to grant your English Church, to bee one of the Reformed Churches. Sir; know, that *Romans* were euer reputed for a very noble and most generous people. To perpetuat therefore their Reputation, I condescend vnto you, and grant it for such: vpon which grāt, I argue thus. The true Church of *Iesus Christ*, was so well Formed by Christ him selfe, that, in matters of faith, it neuer needed Reformation. But your English Church, with those others you speak of, were so Formed, in matters of faith, that they needed an after Reformation. Therefore your English, with those other Reformed Churches, are none of the Churches of *Iesus Christ*. This short touch to your Title alone, & to your owne, and those other Reformed Churches whose,

quarrel you seeme to vndertake. Now to your Text.

Sir Humfrey Epist. Ded. pag. 1.

WE reade in the Ecclesiasticall historie, whē the ancient Christiāns at Antioch, fel at variāce amongst thē selues: it was thought meete (as *Theodore* relateth) by a fauorable report, to allay the bitternesse of their contention with these words. *Both parts make one and the same confession of their faith; for both maintaine the Creed of the Nicen Councell.* *Theodore. histor. eccles. lib. 2. cap. 4.*

The beautifull and sacred name of Truth, speakes Peace to all: and that lovely name of Peace, giues that sweet councell to all Christians, which *Abraham* gaue to *Lot*. *Let there be no strife betwixt thee and me, for we bee bretheren.* *Genes. 13. 8.*

A N S W E R.

To proue the Church of Rome, to bee angrie with your *English*, and other Reformed Churches, without cause, and to allay the bitternesse of this contention, you cite one example out of *Theodore*, how difficultries were cōposed betwixt the ancient Christians: and another out of holy Scripture, how strife was louingly staid betwixt those two bretherē, *Abraham* and *Lot*. You begin, indeed, with sweet words, as if butter would scarcely melt in your mouth; You speake at first in as beautifull, sweet, and peaceable termes, as
one

one would wishe. You reprehend a litle after, sundry writers of ours, for lashing out into discursive language against those of your side: yet your selfe in the very same Sectiō (besides a great deale more else where) burst forth into these bitter and intemperat tearmes, against the whole Church of God, and against her head and inferior Pastors, calling her, *The malignant Church* (pag. 3.) Accusing her, of *Fornication, going a whooring, and playing the harlot* (pag. 5.) Of practising, *manifest, and manifould Idolatrie*. Her Title, *to be vsurpation, Her confidence, presumption: Her deuotion, superstition, And she her selfe, a professed enimie of the Gospel* (pag. 10.) The Pope, of *Lordlynes*, and as *Lord Paramour* about all that are called *Gods: and the Priests, of Luxurie* (pag. 7.

Now, is not this, I pray you, to speake beautiful, sweet, and peaceable words to *all*, when this is spoken to the *whole Church*, and both to the head, and *all* the subordinated Pastors of the same? If *Abraham* had giuen these good words to his brother *Lot*, would it not presently haue pacified all strife betwixt them? If a contentiō should chance to fall betwixt *Sir Humfrey* and his Lady, and he, to pacifie her, should lay vnto her. Let there bee no strife betwixt me and thee, because we two are man and wife: yet should with all, touch her a litle, with the selfe same Titles he doth the Church of Rome, could that honest Lady, euer take such beautifull, louely and peaceable words in euill part? Neuer thinke it. Neuer
opine

opine it. But to set forward into this beautifull
Sweete, and Safe way.

Sir Humphrey pag. 2.

If the Church of Rome, had loued Truth and
Peace, without doute the common bond of
Christianitie, and the Creed which is the gene-
rall Cognoiscance of our faith, would haue inci-
ted them to the like fauorable constructiō of the
Controuersies of this age: and therather, because
their owne learned Cardinall profelleth, *That the
Apostles neuer propounded, as common Articles of
faith, other things, then the Articles of the Apostles
Creed, the Ten Commandements, and some few of the
Sacraments; Because*) saith he) *these things are
simply necessary, and profitable for all men: the rest
are such, as a man may be saued without them* Belar.
de verbo Dei, lib. 4. cap. 11.

A N S W E R.

Let, me once againe be as liberal to you, as I
was a litle before. Suppose the Church of Rome
nether loued Peace, nor Truth, but contrarywise
fauored both faction and falshood: she being mar-
ked by you with manifest Idolatrie, her confidence
being presumption, her deuotion superstition, and she a
professed enemy of the gospel, How were not you
(hauing the light which she did lack) witer then
she? more charitable then she? Why did you not
gaine her by your good example? Why did not
the

the common bond of Christianitie, the Articles of the Apostle Creed, the Ten Commandements, and the Two Sacraments which she still retaineth, work that in you, which it did not in her, and incite you to haue the like fauorable cōstruction of her controuerfies, as you would haue had her, to haue had of yours? The rest, by the Cardinals confession, being such as a man may be saued without them? The seruant who knoweth the will of his Master, and he that knoweth it not, whether of the two deserue the greater punishment? Lord, how palpably do you plead, against your selfe?

I say *secondly*, Suppose the Church of Rome, had not bene so *bitter*, but more sweet and gentle to you, Suppose she had so loued Truth and Peace, that she would haue admitted you into her Societie, and haue liued quietly and amiably with you, as Lot and Abraham did together; Tell me, would you haue admitted her Communion? Would you haue liued quietly and peaceably with her, yea, or no? If yea? Then had you ioyned your selfe in Cōmunion, and entred in league with a malignant Church, with an Idolatrous, and Superstitious Church, and with the professed enemie of the gospel of Christ. But how could the loue you beare to Truth, once euer haue brooked such a bargain? How could you iustifie? how could you defend so wicked a fact? If no? Then to what purpose, nay, how impertinent is it in you, to accuse her of *bitternesse* towards you,

and other Reformed Churches? Of lack of loue of *Truth* and *Peace*, and the like, which neither you may, nor yet intended to contract with her?

Sir Humfrey pag. 3.

But this is the nature of the malignāt Church (and for that cause, the Church of Rome is rightly decyphered by that name) that instead of qualifying the vnquenchable broyles, and intirely preserving the teamelesse garment of Christ, she (*1. Vntruth.*) tearmes vs *Heretiques, Hel-bounds of Zuinglius, Luthers Whelps, Turkish Hugonots, damned persons, and worse then Infidels.* Which vnchristian speeches dipt in lye and gaule, giue iust cause to say with Austen; *Our daylie forname, is our aduersaries tongue.* Aug. Confess. lib. 10. cap. 37.

A N S W E R.

To this accusation I answer *first*, that some of these, if they be true, I cannot excuse from very harste and haltie speeches. Yet confes vnto you, that hauing read all Doctor *Hardings* workes, and looked long both into *M. Iewels Reply* of Anno 1565. and into the *desence* of his *apologie* of anno 1567. to see if these speeches dipt in lye, were of a true and perfect dye, I can finde no such thing there. Which makes me suspect, that, they haue beene added since to that last edition set out by your selues. Moued the rather so to thinke, in behalfe of that worthy man so long deceased, and whom

whom I finde to bee so far from such bitter speeches, that I hould him to bee one of the mildest men, that euer tooke Pen in hand in our English tongue. Nay, grant it bee so, yet is it a plaine iniurie, to impole that vpon the whole Church, which is but the fact of one particular person.

I say *secondly*, touching these Vnchristian speeches, tell me I pray you, are those on your side, more Christian, and more temperate in their talke then we? Let the very words then of one or two of the, beare me witnesse, instead of numbers which might be named, Instead of those prickt downe already in *Master Preston*, Instead of those which also often fall from your owne pen. And first, those already gathered together by the Author of *The Defense of the Censure* pag. 13. printed now nigh fiftie yeares past, and found in D. *Fulkes Retentive*, against M. Doctor *Bristow*, wherein he liberally bestoweth vpon him, these ensuing Lineries. *Vnlearned Dogbolt, shamelesse beast, impudent Ass, barking Dogge, Tolping Curre*; And writing against that incomparable man *Cardinall Allen*, in his Reply to his booke of *Purgatorie*, as if the man had taken some terrible pilles, he purgeth his stomach thus vpon him; *Brasen face, Iron forehead, Impudent blasphemier, Brabbling sycophant, Retchlesse Russian, vnlearned Ass, scornfull Catiffe, Desperate Dick, horrible Hell-bound*. The like sweet and peaceable words he bestoweth vpon M. D. *Stapleton*, in his Answer to his *Forresse*, stiling him, *Sensles block, Popish Swine, Popish Boare, Brazen faced Stapleton*,

pleton, *Block-headed Papist*, & *Drunken Fleming of Douay*. And in his Reioynder to *M. Martiall*, he calleth him thus; *Impudent Ass*, *Blockheaded*, and *shamelesse Ass*, *Blasphemous beast*, *Filthy Hogge*, *Beastlie grunter*, *Shamelesse Dogge*, *Blasphemous Idolater*, *Rayling Ruffian*, and *Slanderous Detull*, with many more which I omit for breuities sake.

Will you see some more of this modest marchandise, both of a latter date, and comming from a man exalted to an eminent place in your English Church? They are the words of *M. Richard Montagues*, now Lord of Chichester; heare with what sweete and beautifull words he be-oyleth his brother *Abraham* in his Answer to the Gagge. Behould the Tallie; tell them vpon your fingers end. *Idiot*, *Imposter*, *Scurrillous fellow*, *Montebanck*, *Buffone*, *Rakeshame*, *Knight of the Post*, *Belzebubs attendant*, *Light-skirt*, *Sbaued Imposter*, *Brasen face*, *Leaden hart*, *Rambling Logodiarrhe*, *false knaue*, *Arrant blunderer*, *Sheepes head*, *Poppet*, *volettered Dolt*, *Braying Animal*, *Babbling Witall*, *Bandogge of Belzebug*, *Giddie Cock scombe*, *Pedler*, *Adle head*, *Misborne Elfe*, *Adle pate*, *Madde Papist*, *Impudent Impostor*, *Detracting varlet*, *Hogge-Rubber*, *Impudent Plagiari*, with almost as many more like venomous words which I omit, against no other man, then even the same that returnes an Answer to your *via Tuta*.

Now, *Sir Humfrey*, to resume your Theme touching her *bisterneße* whom you tearme *the malignant Church*, was this the way the primiriue Christians tooke to asswage the contentions that arose
betwixt

betwixt them? Is this the good counsell, which Abraham gaue to his brother Lot? Is this the way to qualifie vnquenchable broyles, and to preserue entire, the seamlesse garment of Iesus Christ? Or rather are they not the vnchristian speeches which you speake of, dipped in bitterlye and gaule, giuing vs (much more then you) iust occasion to lay with S. Austen. *Our dailie fornace is, our aduersaries tongue.* How litle cause them haue you to complaine of vs for *speeches dipt in lie and gaule?* or how litle credit gaine you to your owne cause, to rubbe that soare, or to insist on that, which your Aduersary can so easily retort vpon you, and that with such infinit disaduantage to you?

Sir Humfrey pag. 4.

It cannot be denied, that the now Reformed, and the ancient Roman Church, are two Sisters, both descended from one and the same Catholique and vniuersall Mother of vs all (2. *vntrush.*) But when the world shall vnderstand, that the Romish Sister hath lost her breasts, at least wise, giuerh her children litle or no spirituall milke out of her two breasts, the two Testaments: when the world shall plainly discerne, that she doth dailie practise spirituall fornication with the inhabitants of the earth: when it shall be witnessed by her self, that her Sister hath kept her first loue, and continued her ancient birth-right (3. *vntrush.*) from the time of the Apostles to the dayes of Luther; will

it not seeme a strange follie, or a wilfull madnesse, to quarell with her Sister, because she will not follow her vnknown wayes, and goe a whooring after her inuentions? If for no other cause, yet for this alone (because she plaied the Harlot) her Sister might better iustifie her separation from her, then the retayning of fellowship with her lewedenesse.

A N S W E R.

1. This, indeed, is the maine pillar, this is the principall ground worke, to vphould and vnderprop, all *Sir Humfreis* rotten building. Take this pillar from him, and we leaue him in a poore case. Pluck this pillar downe, and all the whole building, will fall vpon the Philistians heads, & crush them to death. You heare how confidently he be-
*ginnes, that it cannot be denyed, that the now Reformed, and the Ancient Roman Church, are two Sisters, both descended from one and the same Catholique and vniuersall Mother of vs all: bouldly (or rather impudently) supposing as true, and taken as graunted, that, which principally he should haue pro-
 ued. For this we are as far from granting, as if Sir Humfrey should haue said thus. It cannot be denyed, that Night, is Day, and Day is Night: That white, is black, and black is white: That Michael is in hell, and Belzebub in heauen. That hell, and heauen, are two Sisters, and make all one and the same Church. How wonderfull then, is this deceit! How strange and palpable this bad proceeding! We constantly auerre: we vtterly deny, that*
 the 40

there was euer any one man in the whole world, of the Protestant Religion before *Luther*; We call vpon them, we vrge them to shew vs but so much as one, especially in the ages before *Luther*; they haue not done it; they cannot do it; their Churches wombe hath bene labouring now nere these hundred yeares, to be deliuered of that burthen; that one Infant, is still vnborne, and yet *Sir Humfrey* will needes come vpon vs with this kindnes; It cannot be denied, that the now Reformed, and the Ancient Roman Church, are two Sisters.

2. But to diue a litle deeper into this sillie conceit. You will needes (*Sir Humfrey*) haue it supposed, that the Church of *Rome*, and *Yours*, be two Sisters, both descended of one and the same Mother. This supposed, I make vnto you this demand. Either there is, or hath bene in the world, one particular Church amongst the rest, which hath alwayes borne that honorable Title of the *Mother Church*, or there is not? Againe either the Church of *Rome*, your English Church, or some other Reformed Church, is still this anciēt *Mother Church*. If neither *She*, nor *Yours* be, that truly ancient and *Mother Church*, then must you name some other particular *Mother Church*, the true *Mother* of these two Sisters: because it repugneth in nature, that two Sisters, could beget or bring forth one another: or, that two distinct and different Mothers, could be both owners of the body of one and the same individuall Infant, the whole Church being but one body, and all the children of

of one *Mother*. Againe; Taking nether *Ours*, nor *Yours*, as the ancient *Mother Church*, but only as two *Sisters*, descended of one and the same *Mother*, ether these two *Sisters*, are of the same nature their *Mother* is of, or they are of another nature. If of the same; then how do they differ? for, *as the Mother, so also her daughter*, saith the Scripture (Ezech. 16. 44.) If of another; then how two *Sisters*, descended of one & the same *Mother*? Where now is the quintiscence of this conceit, of the two *Sisters*?

3. To presse this point a litle further. In the old law, there was a *Mother Church*, to wit, *Ierusalem*, which all other inferior *Sinagogues* (as so many daughters) were subiect to: and which, in sundry places of holie Scripture, is called by the name of *Mother*. Now, the old law, was as *S. Paul* saith (Heb. 10. 1.) but a shadow representing vnperfectly and obscurely the singular graces of the new. This therefore is ether accomplished in the new, or it is not. If not; then the Scripture is false (vnles it be yet to come.) If yea, name vs this particular *Mother Church*. *Ierusalem* cannot now be the *Mother Church* of vs *Christiãs*, which hath bene for so many hundred yeares together, a Cage of vncleane birds, in the handes and custodie of *Turkes*. Those of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, *Collossia*, and *Galatia*, are long since fallen quite away from the faith of *Christ*. The diuel hath quite ouer-turnd all those primitive and Apostolicall Chaires. No particular Church (mentioned

cioned in holy Scripture) standeth at this day, not retayneth still the faith of Christ, but the Church of Rome. Therefore *Shee*, and none but *Shee*, is the true Mother Church: according to that of holy Scripture (Ezech. 23. 1.) saying. *And the Word of our Lord was made to me saying. Sonne of man: there were two womē, daughters of one Mother. You haue found vs two Sisters, but haue not found vs neuer a Mother to them: so that ether they must be both Monsters, or one of the two must be the Mother. Yours cannot be the Mother of ours, for we conuerted you, and to vie S. Pauls words, begot you in Christ: therefore ours is the Mother Church.*

4. The Apostle S. Paul, who wrote the first Epistle that euer was wrote in the time of the gospel, addreſſeth the same particularly to the Church of Rome; doubtlesse because she was the first, the chiefe, and Mother Church, and therefore of honor was due to her. Him selfe, accounteth, him selfe a childe of the Roman Church (Rom. 1.) Naming & giuing the precededēce to her faith, before to his owne: an argumēt that he held her for the Mother Church. Calling her faith, *the faith of the whole world.* Ergo the true Mother of all Christians. Nay, if we beleue the words of the Prophet *Isay*, (cap. 66. 19.) He assureth vs, that *Italie*, by name. is she, that shall *shew forth his glorie to the Gentils*, *Italie* by name, shall bring all your bretheren of all nations, a gift to our Lord: therefore she is the Mother of al Christian natiōs. Calling her priests and her seed, *a new beauen, and a new earth*, which hee would

would make to stand before him for ever. All other Churches besides her, are fallen away: how cleare is it then, that she by name is the only Mother Church?

5. From the testimonies of holie Scripture in the behalfe of the Church of Rome, I will next produce the testimonie of her professed aduersaries, so to veresie that sacred saying. *Our God, is not as theirs, our enemies are our iudges*: and first from forre witnesses of the Reformed Church. Calvin confesseth, *Rome was indeed the Mother of all Churches.* lib. 4. Instit. cap. 7. *The Roman Church, is indeed our Mother, in whom; and by whom, God did beget vs.* D. Serauia. Thus much briefly of externes. Our late Soueraigne K. James (Pulpit. Bab. pag. 326.) confesseth her to be, *the Mother Church, and head of all the Western Churches* (witnessed by Doctor Carriar to the King, pag. 18.) D. White. *We professe the Church of Rome it selfe, in all ages to haue beene the visible Church of God.* Disputation of the Church by M. Strasford pag. 105. And what may satisfie any reasonable man, if this may not? Yea, Sir Humfrey (although vnwittingly) in this very place insinuateth the same, where he speaketh of the Church of Romes *Two Breasts*, to wit, the *Two testaments*, out of which she giueth *spirituall mylke vnto her children*: for euen there, and in that, he maketh her the *Mother Church*, vlesse he will say, that it is not the properrie of a Mother to giue mylke, or, that Christ espoused sundry wiues: which were blasphemie to imagine. And to say
the

the truth, She it was, who first gaue your English Church these two Breasts to suck, and therefore is in very deed, not her Sister as (you suppose) but her *Mother*, else had you bene vnborne vntill this presēt. The like you do afterward, where you pretend your Church, to haue beene alwayes harboured in the bosome of the *Romā* Church; where of we shall speake more in his proper place.

Sir Humfrey pag. 5.

It is the councell of the Prophet, If Ephraim be ioyned to Idols, let him alone. If Israel play the harlot, let not Iuda sinne. Babylon was a true Church, with which sometimes the Religious did communicate: but after it was more depraued, the faithfull are commanded to goe out of her. And as we may conceiue for that cause among others, Abraham was commanded to goe forth of Caldea, wherein he was borne, because the inhabitants of the contrie, were Idolaters. And the Hebrewes (the promised time of returning to Canaan being come) were led out of Egypt by Moyses and Aaron, because the Egyptians were giuen to vaine superstitions. Such is our departure from the Church of Rome, or rather from the errors of that Church, that hath departed from her selfe (4. *Vntrist*) and for that cause, Non fugimus, sed fugamur: *We leſt her vnwillingly, nor voluntarily*, that we bee not partakers of her sinne, and that we receiue not her plagues. Reuel. 18. 4.

Q

AN-

ANSWER.

1. If it may suffice, only to accuse, who (saith the cōmon Prouerb) *can escape Scot-free?* In the meane while, I pray the Reader particularly to marke, first, that euen by your owne confession, you *went out*, you departed from the Church of Rome; Ergo you were once in her. Ergo she was once your Mother. Ergo you were once in her bosome, and were nourished by her breasts: which, as I haue proued against M. Preston, pag. 32. and that from the testimonie of holy Scripture, sufficeth of it selfe to condemne you for Heretiques. For it is not lawfull vpon any pretence, to depart out of the true Church. You cōfesse you departed out of her: nor can you name any other. Ergo, departing out of her, you departed out of the true Church.

I say secondly, that your examples of Ephraim, of Iuda, of Abraham, and of Moyse and Arons departure out of Egypt, are vnaptly applyed to proue your purpose. The reason is; They had their warrant from, and out of Gods word, to depart out of those places, named there particularly: proue out of the written word, or any other word of God spoken to you (you who appeale to the only word) that you were wiled to depart out of the Church of Rome, and then shall I grant that the places aforlaid were alleadged pertinently.

I say thirdly, because you freely confesse, a breach, a departure, a going out frō vs, we vrge you, we presse you, we put you to assigne vs the pre-
cise

cise time of your departure. Which of your Reformed Churches it was by name, that first made that blessed breach? What the names were of those your eminent men and blessed Reformed bretheren, that made this breach. Where, and in what Contrie or Kingdome the same was first attempted. Their number. Their maner of proceeding, and the like. If you cannot do this, if you faile in this, then can you not iustifie your departure, otherwise then by confessing it for a plaine Apostacie.

I say thirdly, that the Church of Rome (or some other) is, accordinge to the word of God, *the Ground and Pillar of truth* (1. Tim. 3. 15.) which beareth vp the whole building of the house of God. The *Citie built vpon a hill*, which can not be hid or couered with any cloud of error. Mat. 5. The *Citie of Truth*, the sanctified mount. Zach. 8. 3. The *Chaire of Moyles*, which God him selfe commands to heare. Mat. 23. 2. The *Chast and eternall Spouse of Christ*, which cannot be diuorced from him. Ose 2. 2. Cor. 11. 2. Ever instructed by the *Spirit of Truth*, which hath promised to teach and lead her into her all Truth. Ioh. 16. 12. Alwayes *subiect to Christ*, and therefore neuer rebelleth against him. Ephel. 5. 24. held vp by Christs *right hand*, no doubt to preserve her that she neuer fall. Apoc. 2. 1. from which *the Doctor shall not fly away any more*. Hay 30. 10. from whose mouth the word of our Lord shall not depart, nor from the mouth of his seedes seed, from hence forth, and

for euer, Iſay 59. 21. *A kingdome that ſhall not be deſtroyed.* Dan. 2. 44. *The elect of God, which it is not poſſible may be indued into error.* Mat. 24. 24. *A houſe built vpon a Rock*, which no ſtormes can batter to the ground, Ma. 7. 25. Finally, he who heareth not, is an *Erhnick*: and he who heareth, heareth Chriſt. Mat. 18. 17. But he that heareth Chriſt cannot erre: ergo, he who heareth the Church, of Rome, which you confeſſe to haue bene the true Church (and yet to haue departed from her) cannot erre.

I ſay ſourthly, that touching your calumnie of this Church, I turne you ouer to *S. Auſten*, and other Fathers, who thus defende her integritie. Shew me the like praiſe: ſhew me the like defence, ether of your owne, or of any other Reformed Church, and I will for euer hold my peace: thus
 “then ſaith *S. Auſten*. I know what is writtē in the
 “holy and canonicall ſcriptures concerning the
 “Church of Rome and the faith therof, I know not
 “what you ſay of her Apoſtacie, or falling from her
 “faith. Truly, as we do reade in bookes the which
 “you alſo do honor and reuerence, of the Roman
 “Church and faith therof, ſo alſo reade vnto vs out
 “of bookes, the which we alſo do honor and reue-
 “rence, how ſhe forſooke and loſt her faith. Doth
 “it pleaſe you that we ſhould beleue euery ſlan-
 “derous reproach of men, vpon what occaſion ſo-
 “euer it was vttered and objected againſt the Ro-
 “man Church, the which the holy Ghoſt, hath both
 “deliuered and commended vnto vs by the holy
 ſcrip-

scriptures? This indeed is pleasing to you: but, whom also it should more iustly please, you see, well enough; but you, being ouercome by obstinacie, will not yeld to the truth. And a litle after, Loe here the Roman Church with whom I communicate, where I reade thee her name (Rom. 1. 7, 8.) there finde thou me her faults, if thou canst; but if thou cryest and reheardest them from some other place, we following the voice of our Pastor, evidently declared vnto vs by the mouth of the Apostle S. Paul, do not admit, belieue, or heare your words. My sheepe, saith our heavenly Pastor, heare my voice and follow me. His testimonie of the Roman Church, is not obscure, but very cleare and manifest. Whosoever will not go astray, or wander from his flock, let him heare him, let him follow him. Hitherto S. Austē rom. 7. de unitate eccles. cap. 12. cited by F. Gurdon in his Summarie of controversies Anglice pag. 335.

Fistly, I pray you to hearken what the same worthy Father saith herof else where, discoursing vpon the 47. psal. vers. 9. *God hath founded it for euer: vpon which place he will eth thus. But perhaps that Citie, which hath held vp the world, shall be sometime ouerturned? God forbid. God hath founded it for euer. If therefore God hath founded it for euer, why fearest thou least the skie should fall?* Now to others. Ruffinus of this Church, saith thus. *In the Church of the Roman Citie, no heresie euer began. in explicit. S. Gregorie Nazianzen, thus. Ould Rome, from ancient times, hath the right faith, and alwaies*

keepeth it, as it becometh the Cittie which ouer-ruleth the whole World, alwayes to beleue rightly in God. In carn. de vita sua. Marke yee Sir Humfrey, those two words of such force and energie, *alwaies* keepeth the right faith: *alwaies* beleueth rightly in God. The holie Pope and Martyr S. Lucius, thus. *The Mother of all Churches*: in epist. ad Episcopos Hisp. & Gallia. Rupertus thus. *The Roman Church, more strongly built vpon the Rock of Apostolicall faith, hath stood vnshaken, and hath alwayes condemned the heresies, both of the Greeke Church, & of all the World.* Rupertus lib. 2. de diuinis officijs, all to be found together in the Guide of faith pag. 217. 218.

I say Sixtlye, It is a point most remarkable, that whereas our Sauour speaking of his Church in generall, and saying, that she is *built vpon a rock, which the gates of hell shall not preuaile against*, and S. Paul saying, that she is *without spot or wrinkle*: that if an Angell should teach otherwise, we beleue him not, the holy, venerable and ancient Fathers of the primitive Church, applied all these places and the like, particularly to the Church of Rome. Heare them in their owne words. *Come yee bretheren, if yee will be ingrafted in the vine. It is a grieve, when we see you cut off, so to lie. Number the priests from the Sea of Peter, &c. That is the Rock which the proud gates of hell do not overcome.* Tom. 7. in psal. cont. part. Donati. S. Cyprian elder then he to confirme the promise of our Lord for the preservation of the Roman faith, saith thus. *They are so*

soould to carry letters from prophane Schismatiques, to the chaire of Peter, and the principall Church, whence priestly vnicie rose, not considering the Romans to be those whose faith (the Apostle being the commender) was praised: to whom misbeliese, cannot haue access. Epist. 55. num. 6. So S. Ierom. Apol. ad Ruffinum. lib. 3. cap. 4. tom. 2. Know you, that the Roman faith, commended by the Apostles mouth, will receiue no such deceits, nor can be possibly changed though an Angell taught otherwise. So Gelafius. The chiefe seat of Peter the Apostle, is the Roman Church, not hauing any spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. And to conclude, S. Bernard calleth this Church, the Apostolique chaire, where faith cannot suffer any detriments. So that as our Saviour said of his Church, that she was a Cittie built vpon a hill, which cannot be hid; so these holy Fathers of the Church of Rome, that misbeliese cannot haue access to her: she cannot possibly be changed: in her, faith cannot suffer any detriment: whole hundreds the like could I produce if need were, let these suffice for breuities sake.

Seauenthy, Now, who are you, Sir Humfrey, compared with these Heroes? Who are you in respect of S. Austen, S. Cyprian, S. Ierom, S. Gelafius, and S. Bernard? Of what poisse are your calumnious accusations of the Church of Rome, calling her; The malignant Church, accusing her of Idolatrie, comparing her to Ephraim, to Babilon, to Caldea, and to Egypt, stiling her whoore, harlot, and the like? Nay, you oppose (to vse S. Austens owne

words) not that Church which only hath beene praised by the mouth of men, but that verye Church, *the which the holy Ghost hath both deliuered, and commended to vs by the holy scriptures.* You push at the Pillar (1. Tim. 3. 15.) which you cannot push downe. You bluster at the Rock (Mat. 7. 25.) which you cannot ouer-blow. And wickedly accuse the most immaculate and chaste *Sassanna*, the very Spouse of Christ him selfe, to be a strumpet.

I say *Eightly* and lastly, though you cannot tell the *precise time* of our fall and Apostacie, because it was to secrete, as you afterwarde fancie, yet in all reason you ought to tell vs, the *precise time* of your forsaking vs, then especially when our Idolatrie was most apparant; For, if you can nether tell the *precise time* of our falling from the truth, nor the *precise time* of your findinge it, and forsaking vs, then is this a meere fiction, a meere fancie, and a meere fable; and consequently, as lightly to be contemned by vs, as it was vainly and deceitfully inuented by you. I tell you plainlie Sir, you haue here (as the prouerb saith) *taken the Wolfe by the eare*, not knowing in the world whether you may hold him, or let him goe. To come to these particulars, to do this, is quite and cleane to vndoe your selfe. In a word, to set hand to this, is with your owne handes, to cut the throat of your owne cause. But to creepe forward in this crooked way.

Sir Humfrey pag. 7.

That saying of *Erasmuss*, was not lesse true then wittie; Who being demanded of the Duke of Saxonie, what was *Luthers* capitall offence, that stird vp so many opposites against him, made answer. *Luther* had committed two great crimes: for he had taken away the Crowne (*5. vntruth*) frō the Pope: and had taken downe the belly of the Monkes.

A N S W E R.

1. Now indeed we are put to our plunge, I trow, or neuer. You tell vs, *Sir Humfrey*, that this was the Answer of *Erasmus*, to the Duke: that it was a true, and a wittie answer: But you tell vs not, wherein the Truth, or wit of the Answer lay: nor yet what true & wittie answer, the Duke returned to *Erasmus*. I nagin therefore the Duke had answered *Erasmus* thus. That touching the first fault, of taking the Crowne from the Popes head, it was an vntruth, for his Crowne sets as fast on his head, as it did before. And touching the second fault of taking downe the bellies of Monkes, he had said more truly, if he had said that he had made the bellie of a Nanne, called *Catharine Bore*, swell bigger then it was before. What I pray could *Erasmus* haue answered to the Duke? and which of these two had bene the truer, and the wittier answer? Who can choose but pittie Protestants, to see then produce such poore stuffe, as euery ignorant Papist is thus able to retort vpon them! Well,
let

let vs goe forward, to see if we can come to the sight of some more solid geare.

Sir Humfrey pag. 7. 8.

And surely (setting aside the Popes Lordlynesse, and the luxurie of priests) it shall appeare there is no such cause, why she should breath out Anathemaes, Curses, and Excommunications, with a, *Tradatur Satana*? Let her sister be deliuered to Sathan. Yea, she daylie affordeth peaceable entertainment vnto Iewes and Infidels, when as a poore Christian soule, a beleeuing Protestant, liuing within their reache or compasse, can hardly escape the danger of their mercilesse inquisition.

A N S W E R.

1. Here is a another heauie and haynous complaint made against vs; how shal we be able to answer this? Forsooth (as before) by retorting euery word vpon *Sir Humfrees* owne head. For, do not the Puritans infinitely cry out against the Lordinesse of the English Bishops, tearing the Bishop of Canterburie, the *Pope of Lambeth*? Doth not *M. Rogers* confesse, that they importune to haue the Bishops and Archbishops, all put downe? Preface pag. 10. Again, doe not they themselves breath out Anathemaes, Curses, and Excommunications, with a, *Tradatur Satana*, let her Romish sister be deliuered to Satan? Are not all poore Papists, daylie excommunicated out of their Churches? Doe they not daylie afford peaceable entertainment to Iewes

Iewes and Turkes, when as a poore Christian soule, a beleeuing Papist, coming within their reach, can hardly escape the danger of their English Inquisition? Do they taske a Iew or Turke to pay 20. pounds a month for the vse of his Talmud? Or a hundred markes for euery time he offers at the Altar of his Alcharon? Or twelue pence a peece, for euery Sunday wherein eache seruant in his house goeth not to the Reformed seruice? Or doe their pursuittants hunt them vp and downe both by day night, take their eate off their ground, pul their purses out of their pockets, their clothes and garments off their backs in the open streetes, take their children from them, and breed them vp in a contrary Religiō at their parēts expences? And further shut them vp in prison? Banish them into forraine contries, and the like? Lord haue mercie vpon vs, to seee such poore *Essayes* published by you *Sir Humfrey*, to the view of the world, to vindicat your Mothers cause, and your owne Reputation: such poore and ayeriall proofes, in points of so great moment and importance! But to proceed with this your profound discourse.

Sir Humfrey pag. 8. 9.

Nobis non licet esse tam beatos. The children of this world, are wiler in their generation, then we professe our selues to be. For, as touching the twelue Articles of the Apostles Creed, which are the mayne parts of the Christian Truth, & wherein the Church of Rome doth still persist, we gladly
acknow-

acknowledge her to be of the familie of Iesus (saith Hooker.) And that which S. Paul witnessed of the Israelites (Rom. 11. 28) that in *one respect*, they were enemies: but in another, they were beloved of God; So likewise, as concerning the word of God, and the Apostles Creed, we giue the Church of Rome her due; But in another respect, as she hath created twelue new Articles, & coyned new expositions vpon theould, far different from the doctrine (6. *vntruth*) of the Apostles; as she depends vpon customary Tenents, which make their chiefe clayme by Tradition; as she relies vpon the Church (that is, vpon her owne authoritie) for the last resolution of faith; as she maintayneth and practiseth manifest, and manifould (7. *vntruth*) Idolatrie; as she derogates from the high price of our Redemption (8. *vntruth*) by adding her owne merits and satisfactions, to the merits of Christ; as she aduanceth the Pope for the Lord Paramour about all that are called Gods. In these, & many like respects, we say, her Tenure is meane & base; her Tenents are subiect to alienation; her Articles, are euidences of an vnknown truth; her vnwritten verities, for the most part, are prescriptions within the memorie of man, *Histerna quasi*; her Title, is vsurpation; her confidence, is presumption; her deuotion, is superstition; and she herselfe, a professed enemie to the gospel.

A N S W E R.

1. After you haue spoken a great deale of ill

of the Church of Rome, (pushed I know not with what spirit) you now begin to speake some good of her; not for any good (God wot) you wishe vnto her, but hoping that so couertly vnder this mantel, you may bee able to doe her the greater mischief: which cunning slight you haue (though somewhat more seldome) vsed thorough out this whole Section. For example pag. 2. you tell vs that, both parts make one and the same confession of their faith, for both maintayne the Creed of the Nicen Conncell. Pag. 4. that the now Reformed, and the ancient Roman Church (not were, but) are, two sisters, both descended of one and the same vniuersall Mother of vs all. Pag. 8. 9. That touching the Twelve Articles of the Apostles Creed, which are the maine parts of the Christian Truth, and wherein the Church of Rome doth still persist, we gladly acknowledge her to be of the familie of Iesus &c. pag. 9. The beloued of God. And pag. 3. you cite Bellarmine to proue that these things are simply necessarie and profitable for all men: the rest are such as a man may be saued without them.

2. Now, all this, not extorted, but free lie granted, why do you call the Church of Rome, the malignant Church? Fornicatrix? Whore, and harlot? Accuse her of manifest and manifould Idolatry? And condemne her to be a professed enemy of the gospel, and the like? For can she, with the Church of England, maintaine the Creed of the Nicen Council? Be still a Sister, descended of one and the same Mother? should the same Apostles

postles Creed? Beleeue the selfe same gospell that your selues do? Bee of the familie of Iesus Christ? Be the beloued of God, and the like? and withall, be a fornicatrix, a whore, a harlot, an enimie of the gospell, and a furtherer and dilator of manifest Idolatrie? Doth the familie of Iesus, Christ, consist of a companie of whores and harlots? Is his body composed of such members? Are manifest Idolaters, and enimies of his gospell of his familie, and his beloued friends? Or can one lye with a whore, and not participat of the whordome? Can one possiblie touch such pitch, and yet not be defyled therewith? O Delphicall, o Ænigmaticall, o deepe Chymericall conceit of
Sir Humphrey!

3. But because you say, she still persists in the Apostles Creed, which you call the *themaine parts of the Christian Truth*, wherof the maynest part of all those maine parts, is to *beleeue the Catholique Church*: out of this confession, I make vnto you this demand. Ether she beleeues the true Catholique Church (according to this Article) or she doth not. If yea? How can she be a false Church? If no? How persists she still in the maine parts of the Christian Truth? The like I say of *the word of God*, which you say, she still retayneth. Ether she retayneth the word of God, together with the true sence of the same word: or she retayneth the word only, without the sence. If the word, without the sence? so may the Turke, and so doth the Jew, as well as shee. If together with the
sence,

sence, why accuse you her of manifest Idolatrie, of fornication, and the like?

4. Nay, how iustifie you the very Title of this Section, if it be true which your selfe cite out of Bellarmine, to wit, that the positive things which the Church of Rome houldeth together with yours, are *simplicie necessarie and profitable for all men, the rest such as a man may be saued without them?* For if this be true, besides that you depart frō the Church of Rome, not she from you, then is your bitterness against her without any cause; for that, by your owne confession, the other things besides these, are such, as a man may be saued without them. Thē, you beleeuing Purgatorie, Prayers to Saints, Merit of good workes, Seauen Sacraments, and the like, might securely haue condiscended to all this, without the breach of vnitie, without going out, without renting in two, the seamlesse garment of Iesus Christ: and consequently, can be accounted no lesse then Schismaticques at the least for doing the contrary.

5. I say therefore *fistly*, the substance of this Section, consisting in your shallow conceit of the two Sisters, I will make vnto you this supposition, wherto if you looke not carefully, or recall what you haue already said, will proue me to be your kinsman, and (dying without heires, or committing some imaginarie cryme, which I will lay to your charge) all your land come to be myne. I say then first; It cannot bee denyed but that Sir Humfrey and I, are two Bretheren, both descended

ded from one and the same ancient familie, and from one and the same Mother of vs both. This foundation first laid, I now goe forward in your ownewords; But when the world shall vnderstand, that *Sir Humfrey*, my Brother, hath lost his birth-right. When the world shall plainly discern, that he doth daylie practise fornication with the inhabitants of the earth; when it shall be witnessed by him selfe, that his Brother hath kept his first loue, and continued his ancient birth-right; will it not seeme a strange follie, or a wilfull madnesse, to quarell with his honest brother, because he wil not follow his vnknowen wayes, and goe a whoring after his inuentions? If for no other cause, yet for this alone, because he hath plaid the harlot, his brother may better iustifie his separation from him, then the retayning of fellowship with his lewednesse.

6. Now, is not the case the very lame? Grant for true and vdeniable, that I am indeed *Sir Humfreis* Brother; cōfesse all these imaginarie crymes, which I haue forged against him, to be as true as gospel; or suppose *Sir Humfrey* dead (whose life God lengthen, vntill such time as hee returne an Answer) then will it easily follow, that dying without heires his land is myne. After this Supposition, I next make you this proposition.

7. Whosoever shall affirme, that any of the 39. English Articles, are superstitious or erroneous, is excommunicat. But *Sir Humfrey* affirms that the English Chtrch, kept her first loue, and continued

nued her ancient birth-right, from the time of the Apostles, to the dayes of Luther; that is to say, neuer erred, the contrary whereof is auerred in the 21. English Article. Ergo Sir Humfrey is excommunicate.

7. To play vpon you therefore with your owne words. *Is not this a strang folly, or a wilfull madnesse, to quarrell with your sister of Rome, for not keeping her first loue, for not continuing her ancient birth-right, when it is an Article of your owne new Creed, that the Church may erre, and sometimes hath erred, euen in things pertayning vnto God? How iustly and how pertinently (would I be tedious) might I retort euery word of this Chapter or Section vpon your selfe? The beautifull and sacred name of Truth, speakes peace to all &c. Gives that sweet counsell to all Christians, Which Abraham gaue to Lot &c. If the Church of England had loued truth and peace, without doubt she would neuer haue contradicted her owne Article, punishing poore Papists for erring, which according to an Article of her owne faith, cannot choose but erre, euen in things pertayning vnto God. But this is the nature of the malignant Church (and for that cause the Church of England is rightly deciphered by that name) that instead of qualifying the vnquenchable broyles, and intirely preserving the solemne garment of Iesus Christ, she tearmes her Romish sister, fornicatrix, whore, harlot &c. It cannot be denyed, that the now Romish Church, and the now new Reformed Church, are two sisters, both descended from one and the same Ca-*

sholique and vniuersall Mother of vs all. But When the World shall vnderstand, that the English sister hath left her breasts &c. When the World shall plainly vnderstand, that she doth daily practise spirituall fornication with the inhabitants of the earth; When it shall be witnessed by her selfe, that her sister hath kept her first loue &c. Will it not seeme a strang folie or a wilfull madnesse, to quarrell with her sister, because she will not follow her vnknowen wayes, and go a whoring after her inuentions &c? And so goe forward with your example of Israels going out of Babilon. Of Abrahams going out of Chaldea. And the Hebrues going out of Egypt. And then to conclude that, such is our departure from the Church of England, or rather from the errors of that Church, that had departed from her selfe, and for that cause, non fugamus, sed fugamur. We left her vndwillingly, not voluntarily; that we be not partakers of her sinne, and that we receiue not her plagues. Reuelatiōs 18. 4.

8. O peece of scripture well applyed! Rightly was this taken out of the Reuelations, which so palpably reuealeth the poorenes of this discourse. Lord haue mercy vpon vs, Christ haue mercy vpon vs, Lord haue mercy vpon vs, to see with what poore and sillie eyes, vnlearned Protestants reade such poore and sillie bookes; and to see with what poore and sillie shifts, learned Protestants seeke to deceiue their simple Readers, and yet when all is done, the shift is so sorrie and so sillie, that it will not serue the turne! Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, sith both
your

your selfe assure vs pag. 3. Epist. Ded. that *It is, an*
undoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, *that*
the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the
first Age, had vible Professors in all Ages. Sith also the
 word of God it selfe assureth vs. *And he gaue some*
Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euange-
lists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. to con-
tinue vntill we meet all in the vnitie of faith (Ephes.
 4. 11. These Apostles of yours, these Prophets,
 these Euangelicall preachers, these Pastors, these
 Doctors of your profession, these I say, are those
 which both by the Challenge you ought to shew,
 which by promise you are bound to shew, and
 which we only expect that you shew: else you
 plainly flie the state of the question, and we must
 still crie out, as loud as euer we did. *Where was*
your Church before Luther? But enough of this;
 Now to the second Section.

Section II.

THe occasion of the contention betwixt the Churches, originally proceeded from the Romanists, by their owne confession (9. vntruth.)

A N S W E R.

I answer first, that this is euen as true, as Satan should say, that the occasion of the contention betwixt God and him, originally proceeded

from God himfelfe . Or a malefactor at the bar, should pretend , thecaufe of all his troubles and imprifonmēt, to proceed from the Iaylor, the Magiftrat, and the lawfull Iudge, not from him. For would y^e have hereticks arife in the Church, to trouble her peace, and not be punifhed ? What heretick that euer was, might not fay as much as you do here, to vindicat his hereticall caufe, and his owne reputation? to wit, that the occafion of the contention betwixt him, and thofe that iuftly punifht him, proceeded from them, and not from him? How might not *Hacquet* whom yee hangd, and *Legat* the Arrian whom yee burnd , tell you, that the occafion of the contention betwixt you and them, originally proceeded from your Englifh Church?

I lay *fecundly*, how much more trulie , may the trauelled and afflicted Catholiques, iuftly tell you, that the occafion of the contention betwixt you and them , originally proceeded from the Proteftants ? For , did we firft enter into your Churches, throw downe your Altars , breake downe your Images , turne your Archbifhops , Bifhops and other Ecclefiaticall perfons out of doores ? Spoile them of their livings, imprifon their perfons, deprive them of their liues, or you ours ? If we did all this firft to you , then name vs your Churches, Altars, or Communion Tables which we threw downe before *Luther*. Name vs your Bifhops, and other Ecclefiaticall perfons thus inhumanely treated and handled by vs. Tell vs in
what

what Kingdome it was? In what yeare? vnder what King, or Emperors raigne, in all the world before *Luther*? If you cannot do this, then are these meere verball flashes, meere florishes, meere crutches, and meere chymeraes, without other entitie or soliditie, then your owne single and imagined forgerie; dealing with vs here, iust as you did in the former *Section*. For there you laid a false foundation, and then began to build thereon, mightie Castles (in your owne conceit) of Straw and Stubble, not able to endure any least storme, & easilie pusht to the ground with one of the selfe same strawes, wherof the whole was constructed, and so do you here. There you leaned to a rotten pillar, which being puld downe, all your whole building falls to the ground: so do you here. There you seriously suppose (and whether wee will or no, will constrain vs to grant) that the Ancient Roman Church, and the now Reformed Church, are two Sisters &c. so, most deceitfully, do you here, four severall times: namely, pag. 11. 14. 17. 18. There you suppose and beg as granted, that which principally you should haue proved, and so do you here. There I told you, that we no more beleue, that your Church & Ours, are two Sisters, then that *Sir Humfrey* and I, are two Brothers, or that *S. Michael* is damned, and *Belzebub* laued, and so do I here. Suppose no longer, but proue vnto vs. Beg not that which wee will neuer bestow vpon you. If you be a truly ancient Christian knight and kinne to vs, shew vs

this by your Extraction. And now to come to that which is vnder the Section it selfe, thus you say.

Sir Humfrey pag. 11.

But before we enter into the debates and differences of these times, it will not be amisse to looke back and examine, the cause of this great calamitie and distraction in the Christian Church: and to enquire by whom, and by what meanes this bitter contention is fallen out, betwixt the two Sisters. *Cassander*, a learned Papist (10. *Vn-truth*) tooke speciall notice, that these two Sisters were fallen a lunder, euen to the diuiding of the houlshould: he also obserued the Author of thole fresh-bleeding wounds; and accordingly, as, an eye-witnesse of thole differences, protesteth openly, that *the fault is to be laid vpon those, which being puffed vp with vaine insolent conceits of their Ecclesiasticall power, proudly and scornfully, contemned and reiected them, which did rightly and modestly admonish the Reformation*. If we shall further inquire of him, what remedie might bee applied to such dangerous diseales; he professeth seriously, that *the Church can neuer hope for any firme peace, vnlesse they begin to make it, which haue given the cause of that distraction*. If we further presse him for his aduice how to procure that peace from them, which first occasioned the falling off, he replies and confidently assures vs, that *this cannot be effected. vnlesse those which are in place of Ecclesiasticall gouernment, would be content to remit something of*

their

their too much rigor, and yeld somewhat to the peace of the Church, and hearkning vnto the earnest prayers, and admonitions of many godly men. Will set themselves to correct abuses, according to the Rule of diuine Scriptures, and the Primitiue Church from which they haue swarued. Cassandre Consult. 56. & 57.

A N S W E R.

Here is a tale, as I throw, of great waight, and therefore worthy to be well retayned. Before you enter into the differences them selues, you thinke it not amisse, to *looke back*, and examine the cause of this great distraction in the Christian Church. And, to enquire by *whom*, and by *what meanes*, this bitter contention is fallen out betwixt the *two Sisters*. Well, to giue attention to this tale, 1. How far will you haue vs to *looke back*? Your answer is, to G. Cassander. We are content to do as you will haue vs. But aske 2. Who this Cassander is? You paint him forth for a learned Papist. We aske 3. What Papist assures him to bee learned, and a Papist? My selfe, after much search and enquirie, neuer heard him reputed for one or other, vnlesse by the learned Papist Sir Humfrey Lynde, but for an obscure fellow and an heretique. How then proposed for a Papist. We aske 4. How long since did this Cassander liue, becaule he is brought as an eye-witnesse of the distraction betwixt the *two Sisters*? We finde the fellow liued since *Luthers* dayes: But did the two imagined Sisters, keep house together peaceably for whole,

1500. yeares? We aske 5. Who the particular Author was, that *Cassander* obserued? But no other Answer is giue hitherto, saue, that it was in those which were in place of Ecclesiasticall power and gouernment: to wit, in the Pastors of the whole Church, all which were vainely puffed vp with insolent conceits of their owne power, in respect of this rightly godly and modest *G. Cas.* We aske 6. Who those other godly men were, who together with *Cassander*, did rightly admonish this Reformation? But none are named saue he alone: and what needed any more, hee doing the same rightly, & modestly? We aske 7. What the points were in particular, which hee would haue Reformed in the whole Church? But none are named: so that this was wholly to be left to godly *G. Cassanders* iudgment and discretion.

Loe, what a Tale here is told, of this iollie *G. Cas.* Who though learned; though taking speciall notice of the distinction betwixt the two Sitters; though observing the Author, of the fresh bleeding wounds; though an eye Witnesse of the differences, though protesting openly where the fault was; though offering to apply a remedy to such a dangerous disease; though giving his aduise how to procure that peace which first occasioned the falling off; though admonishing rightly and modestly the Reformation; though employing his owne, and other godly mens prayers to this purpose, yet for all this, nether his petitions, nor admonitions were admitted; *George* was contemned, *George* was

was reiectcd, abuses were not corrected according to *Georges* Rule, and therefore in *Georges* iudgmēt, a firme peace, neuer to be expected: wheras, would those in place of Ecclesiasticall gouernment, haue forthwith followed *Georges* aduice, and put the matter wholly into his, and those other godly mens handes, the peace of the whole Church had presently bene procured and abuses corrected according to the Rule of diuine Scriptures, and the Primitiue times, from which the whole Church then swarued. Was it not great pittie, to see the insolent pride of the Papists? Was it not a great oversight in the Pastors of the Church, to overslip such a goodly occasion, as was then offered them? If we should send such a iollie *George* as this, to admonish Protestants rightly and modestly of a Reformation, of such things as dislike vs at this day in their Religion, becaule not rectified by the Rule of diuine Scriptures, and swaruing with all frō the practise of the primitive Church, thinke you whether the Petitiō should be presētly heard, and the Reformation forthwith follow, or both the Petitioner, with his Petition, put in to the first paire of Stocks that could bee found, to curb the pride of such a saucie Compagnion?

Sir Humfrey pag. 13.

Here is a plaine confession of a learned Romanist, that many abuses were crept into the Romā Church: here is likewise acknowledgment, of a distempe-

distemperature that proceedeth from the head (and we know when the Head is distempered, comonly the whole body is out of order) Now to rectifie these abuses, he prescribes a Rule, which is the holy Scriptures, and he sets before vs an ancient patterne for our instruction, which is the primitive Church.

A N S W E R.

You multiplie vntruths without measure. Nether was, or is, the fellow you speake of, reputed with vs for a learned mā. Nor for a Romanist. Nor doth he speake one only word in al that you haue yet cited of him, expressly of the Church of Rome. For the distempre that you speake of in the head, was it nor in the head of this *George*, which would take vpon him to rectifie the whole Church, so as that the whole Christian world must subscribe to his censure? And for the Rule hee would prescribe, did this *Cassandre* first bring to light the holy Scriptures? Or was the Church without them, and without the patterne of the primitive times, vntill the coming of *Cassander*? What goodlie gue-gawes call you these?

Sir Humfrey pag. 14.

If the Scripture be the Rule of Truth, and the ancient doctrine be the patterne of a true Church, how can our religion be charged with heresie, which professeth the Scripture to be the sole Rule of Truth? Or how cā it be iustly accused of Nouel-
tic,

tie, as deriued from *Luther*, when it is a Canon published for the direction of Preachers and Pastors in our Church (viz.) *That they should neuer teach anything as matter of faith, religiously to be obserued; but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the old and new Testament, and collected out of the same doctrine by the ancient Fathers, and Catholique Bishops of the Church.*

A N S W E R.

Yes Sir, I will tell you how you may be charged with heresie notwithstanding. For to hould the Scripture to be the Rule of faith, is true: but to hould it to be the *sole* Rule of Faith, this is heresie: because you make that a point of faith, as out of Scripture, for which you haue no Scripture. Had you liued within the first two thousand yeares from the Creation, you, and your Reformed Church, should, according to this account, haue bene without any Rule of faith at all, because no Scriptures at all were then written. What would you haue done in this case? or what Councell would learned *Cassander* haue given you, or vs?

Touching your *second* demand, how you can be accused of Noueltie, as deriued from *Luther*, I remit you to what I haue already said to *M. Preston* about that point, pag. 40. From some body, I suppose, you were deriued; If not from *Luther*, then put vs downe at last the name of him that was your first Apostle, and from whom you were deriued, so once to close vp this shamefull rift. But touching

touching your Canon, I am to tax you with diuers things. And 1. I demand who made this Canon? 2. How long since it is, that it was made? 3. Whether you hold it as an Article of faith, which binds your Preachers and your Pastors, yea, or no, to the keeping? 4. Is it such as alw yes hath, & can be alwayes kept, yea, or no? If such as hath bene alw yes kept, then why cry you out for a Reformation? If such as nether hath, nor can be kept, then what the better though your Church command it? If you returne an Answer in time, I promise you not to die in your det.

Sir Humfrey pag. 15.

Let vs ascend higher, and looke into former ages, and there let vs examine, whether these two Sisters agreed in vnitie of doctrine, in one and the same house. It is reported of *Redwall*, King of the East Saxons, that he was the first of all his nation, that was bap-ized and receined Chritianitie: b it afterwards being seduced by his wife, he had in the selfe same Church (saith Bede) one Altar for Christs Religion; and another for seruices vnto Diuels. Such was the state of the Roman Church (11. *vntrust*) especially in the ages that the Deuil was let loose. There were some that did cōsecrate themselves, and their seruice to the right worship of God alone: others to the adoration of Saints and Images. There were some that did cōstantly adore the Creator in his bodily presence in heauen: whilst others in the same Church, did
igno-

ignorantlie worship the creature, a consecrated host vpon the Altar. And thereupon Michael Cecenas, Generall of the Order of the Franciscans, about 400. yeares past, observing the different opinions of different members in the same Church, complained, There were two Churches; the one, of the wicked sort flourishing, in which the Pope, raigned: the other of godly and good men, and, this Church he persecuted.

A N S W E R.

You haue brought vs, *Sir Humfrey*, in this second Section, two or three severall testimonies, to proue your pleatant conceit of the two Sisters. One, out of *Cassander*, one out of *Beda* of King *Redwald*, and a third out of one *Michael Cecenas*. That of *Cassander*, we haue discust before. That of *Redwald*, you recount out of *Cambden*; you tell vs that he was King of the East Saxons. That he was the first of all his nation, that was Baptised. That afterwards, he was seduced by his wife: hauing in the selfe same Church one Altar for Christs Religion, another for Sacrifices vnto Devils. Of *Michael Cecenas*, you tell vs, that he was Generall of the Order of the Franciscans: and the time to be about 400. yeares since. Marke now, for Gods sake, how by your owne words, you evidently bewray the badnesse of your owne cause? Mark how the Lapwing, with her owne skreeking, foolishly oilcouers her owne nest. For sith you can recite vnto vs the severall names and surnames of these

touching your Canon, I am to tax you with diuers things. And 1. I demand who made this Canon? 2. How long since it is, that it was made? 3. Whether you hold it as an Article of faith, which binds your Preachers and your Pastors, yea, or no, to the keeping? 4. Is it such as alwayes hath, & can be alwayes kept, yea, or no? If such as bene alwayes kept, then why cry you of Reformation? If such as nether hath, nor can be kept, then what the better though you command it? If you returne an Answer, I promise you not to die in your det.

Sir Humfrey pag. 15.

Let vs ascend higher, and looke into the ages, and there let vs examine, whether the Sisters agreed in vnitie of doctrine, in one and the same house. It is reported of *Redwall*, King of the East Saxons, that he was the first of all his nation, that was baptized and receiued Chritianitie: but afterwards being seduced by his wife, he had in the selfe same Church (saith Bede) one Altar for Christs Religion; and another for seruices vnto Diuels. Such was the state of the Roman Church (i. *vnto truth*) especially in the ages that the Deuil was let loose. There were some that did cōsecrate themselves, and their seruice to the right worship of God alone: others to the adoration of Saints and Images. There were some that did cōstantly adore the Creator in his bodily preface in heauen: whilst others in the same Church, did igno-

ignorantlie worship the creature, a consecrated
 host vpon the Altar. And thereupon Michael Ce-
 caenas, Generall of the Order of the Franciscans,
 about 400. yeares past, obseruing the different opi-
 nions of different members in the same Church,
 complained, There were two Churches; the one,
 a wicked sort flourishing, in which the Pope,
 the other of godly and good men, and
 he persecuted.

A N S W E R.

brought vs, Sir Humfrey, in this se-
 cond, two or three severall testimonies,
 of your pleatant conceit of the two Sisters.
 Of Cassader, one out of Beda of King Red-
 wald, a third out of one Michael Cecaneas. That
 of Cassader, we haue discust before. That of Red-
 wald, you recount out of Cambden; you tell vs
 that he was King of the East Saxons. That he was
 the first of all his nation, that was Baptised. That
 afterwards, he was seduced by his wife: hauing
 in the selfe same Church one Altar for Christs
 Religion, another for Sacrifices vnto Deuils. Of
 Michael Cecaneas, you tell vs, that he was Generall
 of the Order of the Franciscans: and the time to
 be about 400. yeares since. Marke now, for Gods
 sake, how by your owne words, you euidently
 bewray the badnesse of your owne cause? Mark
 how the Lapwing, with her owne skreeking, foo-
 lishly discouers her owne nest. For sith you can
 recite vnto vs the severall names and surnames of
 these

these persons. Their severall sayings. The times they lived in. Their different Religion; and the state of perfection which some of them professed, why could you not as well do this, in producing and recounting vs, the particular names of those Protestants who lived, especially in the Ages before Luther? Why could you not tell vs the time they lived in, together with their estate and profession of life, as well as of these? How comes it to passe, that you retaine the names of Idolaters, and of their wicked facts, and their wives, and haue not retayned the names of your Protestant professors and their wives? *Redwald* was the first of his nation that was Baptized, though he after fell. Who was the first baptized protestant in that age, who after his baptism did not fall? How call you his wife? How call you the historiographer that recount (as *Beda* doth) either his vices or his virtues? There were the Altars erected for Christs Religion, can you shew vs one erected in all your Reformed Church?

Secondly, you tell vs in this place, that such was the state of the Roman Church, especially in the ages that the Duell was let loose. There were some that did consecrate themselves & their seruice to the right worship of God alone, others to the adoration of Saints and Images &c. Now, we all know in what Age *S. Beda* lived: to wit, 800. yeares agoe: Of which of the two Churches I pray was he. We know in what age *Redwald* and his wife lived. You name vnto vs *Beda*, *Redwald*, and his wife, and their sacrifici-

crifcing vnto Diuels, but you name vs not in what age the Diuel was let loofe. You nether tell vs the name of thofe *some*, that did consecrat them felues, and their f-ruice, to the right worfhip of God alone, nor of their wiues, nor the name of any one Deuil let loofe in that age, which yet are ofte named in holy fcripture. What elfe is this, but to tel vs in plaine tearmes, that you cā name none? That one may as fome recount the name of a vifible diuell in that age (and fooner too) then of a vifible Proteftant Profeflor? How then do you forget your felfe to tell vs, that the Challenge fent vnto you by the Iefuit, was. *That Sir Humfrey, or his friends, fhould proue out of fome good Authors, that the Proteftant Church was in all ages vifible, efppeciallie in the ages before Luther?* How doe you forget your felfe? How do you contradift your felfe, to tell vs. Epift. Ded. pag. 3. *It is an vndouted truth, and fubfcribed by both parties, that the faith which Chrift and his Apostles taught, in the firft age, had vifible profeflors in al ages, and neuer fo much as name vs one? Was Caffander of your Religion? Was Casanar the Friar of your Religion? Was Bede of your Religion? Was Redwald or his wife of your Religion?* I coniure you, as you are a Chriftian, as you are a Gentleman, and a Knight, to returne me anfw-
wer, yea, or no.

3. To conclude therefore this Section with your wittie conceit of the falling out of the two Sisters, making faithfull beleeuers, and damnable Idolaters, to dwell and fubfift together in one and
the

the same house and Church of God, wherof the sole recitation, sufficeth alone for a refutation, will you see this sillie conceit (with all you haue said as well of *Cassander*, as of *Cecanus*) entirely retorted vpon your selfe? Take it then from the printed complaints of two Admonitions to the Parliament, written by learned Protestants them selues, who tooke speciall notice, that these two Sisters (*Protestantisme*, and *Puritanisme*) were fallen a sunder, euen to the diuiding of the hous-hould. They also obserued, the Authors of those fresh bleeding wounds, and accordingly, as eye witnesses of those differēces, protested openly, that *There is no right Religion Established in England. They bee all Infidels who goe to the late Churches of England. It shall be easier for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of iudgment, then for the court of Parliament, by which the Protestant Religion was confirmed. The English congregation, consisteth of all sorts of vncleane spirits, and is no member of Christ. The regiment therof is vnlawfull, and Antechristian. Their Sacraments no Sacraments. It is a very Babilon.* Fitzsimon Reply to Mr. Riders Rescript pag. 68. 69. If we shall further enquire of them, what remedie might bee applyed to such dangerous diseases, they professe seriously they shall neuer haue it, Till Archbishops, and Bishops bee put downe, and all Ministers made equall. M. Rogers Pref. pag. 10. vpon the 39. Art. If we further presse them for aduise, how to procure that peace from them, which first occasioned the falling off, they reply cōfidently, and assure vs that

that this can, or be effected, Till Kings & Queenes, do subiect them selues vnto the Church: submit them selues: throw downe their Crownes before the Church: and lick vp the dust of the feet of the Church M. Rogers *ibid.* Becaule, his meeke and humble Cleargie, haue power to binde their King in chaynes, and their Prince in lincks of iron: and (in case they see cause) to proceed against him as a Tyrant. Filtz. Simons *ibid.*

Now, Sir Humfrey, am I euen with you, yea, or no? Haue I repaid you in your owne species? I thinke by what hath bene said, a childe would be able to retort the rest, and to tell you, as you do vs, that Here is a plaine confession of learned Protestants, that many abuses are crept into the English Church. Here is likewise an acknowledgment, of a distemperature that proceedeth from the Head (and we know, when the Head is distempered, comonly the whole body is out of ordre.) Now to rectifie these abuses, they prescribe a Rule, of putting downe all Archbishops and Bishops; of Kings and Queenes, subiecting them selues vnto the Church; licking vp the dust of her feete; and suffering their meeke and humble cleargie, to lay them softly vp in lincks of iron; all according to the holy Scripture, and ancient patterne of the primitive Church.

5. Here will I leaue Sir Humfrey Lynd, a litle, while to chew the cudde. To take a litle nappe of contemplation, in his Isle of Pathmos, to provide him self afterwards for his Reply, Meane while,

whilst he reposes, let vs pray. *Lord haue mercie vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs,* to see the pouertie of this Reply! To see the Sā-
dinesse of this *Safe Way!* To see the insufficiencie of *Sir Humfries* Essay. To see how sorilie this childe of Truth, hath vindicated his Mothers cause, and maintayned his owne reputation, being pressed to proue out of some good Authors; *Where was your Church before Luther?* Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, especially sith you selfe confesse; It is an vn-
doubted truth, and subscribed vnto by both parties, that the faith which Christ & his Apottles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all ages. Especially sith that great Apostle assureth vs, *And hee gaue some Apottles, and some Prophess, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue, vntill we meet all in the vnitie of faith.*

Section III. *Sir Humfrey* pag. 19.

Corruptions both in faith (12. Vntruth) and maners, confessed by the members of the Roman Church, and yet the Reformation denied by the Pope, and *Why.*

A N S W E R.

1. Here againe is more of the poorest and for-
giest stuffe, that may be imagined. You tell vs,
forsooth,

forsooth, that there are corruptions both in faith and maners in the Church of Rome, and yet the Reformation thereof denied. Which were it true, what is this to purpose to proue what you promised? How hangs this together? There are corruptions in the Church of Rome. Therefore the Protestant Church was visible in all ages before *Luther*? There are corruptions in the Church of Rome. Therefore Protestants can shewe a Catalogue of names of such as professed in all ages, the 39. Articles of their Religion? I say no more, because, I shewed before the follie and insufficiency of such vnfit and fabulous inferences.

2. Again, when all is said, what for Gods sake is more laid in this Section, then in the two former? For in the first, the Church of Rome was a malignant Church pag. 5. practised spirituall fornication with the inhabitants of the earth; continued not her first loue, went a whoring; played the harlot, and the like. In the second, she is puffed vp with vaine insolent conceits of her Ecclesiastical power pag. 11. Proudly and scornfully contemnes those that did admonish her of a Reformation. *Sir Humfrey* findes out a plaine confession of a learned Romanist, of many abuses crept into the Roman Church. Of a distemperature both in head and members; with many moe such goodly God-morrowes. Here in this 3. Section, thinking to find some new matter, thinking to find, *Where was your Church before Luther*? We find a tale of Tom Thumbe; a needlesse repetition of that

S 2

which

which he had spent two whole Sections about already before; still the same Cuckoos song: still about the corruptions of the Church of Rome: which tale of a Tubbe, had beene already told vs twice before. What poorer stuffe? What forrier shifte? What more simple flighte can bee imagined in a man, who hath vndertakē to make the *World* to know, that it is an easie matter for a meane lay-Protestant, to answer any learned Papist? In one who hath vndertaken to vindicate his Mothers cause, and his owne reputation, both which he hath exposed to such notorious defamiation?

3. But to come to the particulars themselves, I meane to those pretended Corruptions, which *Sir Humfrey* so roundly layeth to the charge of the Church of Rome, and yet forsooth are not reformed; the Catalogue wherof (instead of a *Catalogue of the names of such Protestants, as taught and professed in all ages, the 39. Articles of their Religion*) are as follow. I will set them downe as briefly as I may.

Sir Humfrey pag. 20. 21.

First 1. Collecting of mony for Indulgences, wherof the Church of Rome complained (13. *Vntruth*) 2. Of bargaines to say Masses for monie. 3. Of wanton and lasciuious songs, mingled with the Organs in time of Masse. (14. *Vntruth*) 4. Of certaine number of Candles at Masses 5. Of Priuat Masse which they wished to bee restored to the
ancient

ancient custome of the Reformed Church (15 *Vn-truth*) 6. And lastlie, concerning Latin seruice.

ANSWER.

1. Were all true which is objected, as the greatest part by far is false, yet the points repeated by him selfe, are but matters of fact, not one of faith: only Ceremoniall, or the like, and hath not *Sir Humfrey* him selfe truly told vs in his first Section pag. 3 out of our owne learned Cardinal, *That the Apostles neuer propounded, as common Articles of faith, other things, then the Articles of the Apostles Creed, the ten Commandements, and some few of the Sacraments: because these things are simply necessarie and profitable for all men; the rest are such as a man may be saued without them.* Which being so, euen by that learned Authoritie cited by *Sir Humfrey* him selfe, we retayning still, the Articles of the Apostles Creed, the ten Commandments, and as many Sacraments as Protestants doe: it followes that these pretended Corruptions here recited, be such as in their owne censures, are compatible, & Papists may practise without any preiudice to their saluation. To what purpose then do Protestants keepe such a coyle for Reformation? And turmoyle them selues and others, mouing heauen and earth, about such triuall accusations?

2. But now, *Sir Humfrey*, o require your kindnesse, with the like corruptions, laid by your owne bretheren to the charge of your English Church, and not to deale with you as you doe

with vs, to cite authorities against vs (as you do here out of *Cassander* and others) and then to make the world belieue, they were learned Papists. when as indeed they were our enimies, and rancke Heretikes: consider the points, and heare I pray what they do say (1.) They affirme the saying. *Glorie be to the Father; and to the Sonne, and to the holy Ghost*, to be a vaine repetition. *Survey of the booke of Common prayer anno 1606. pag. 47.* (2.) That the *Pater noster*, is not to be said, no not for sauing life it selfe; *Richard Alison* (3.) The signe of the Crosse, to be a part of the beastes marke. *Survey &c. pag. 102. 103.* (4.) Baptisme not to regenerate: not acceptable to a tendre conscience with the signe of the Crosse: not to be necessarie absolutely. *Survey &c pag. 87. 88.* (5.) God-fathers and God mothers to be papisticall. *Ibid. pag. 88.* (6.) Confirmation to be a corrupt following of the Apostles. *Ibid. pag. 128.* (7.) Bishops to be members, not of Christ, but of the Diuell and Antechrist. *The arraignment of Barroes 20. of April. 1592.* (8.) The Church to haue no head in earth. *Barroes arraignment.* All cited at large by F. Filtzsimons (with as many moe) in his *Reply to M. Riders Rescript pag. 65. 66. &c.* Part wherof (& many moe which I omit) M. Thomas Rogers, a learned Protestant, in his Epistle Dedicatorie to the Lord Archbishop of Canterburie, pag. 9. citeth the words of the bretheren, complaining thus. These points are of such importance, as if euery haire of our heads, were a life, we ought to afford them in defence
of

of these matters. Et pag. 10 The controuersie betwixt the Bishops & vs, is not as they would make the world beleue, about a Cap, Tippet, or Surplesse, but for greater matters, concerning a true Ministrie, and regiment of the Church, according to the Word of God &c. Which we shall neuer haue, till Archbishopps and Bishops be put downe. And pag. 13. Our controuersie is, Whether Iesus Christ shall be King, or no.

3. This premised, and proued to be true by the relation of your owne, and our learned Authors, and M. Thomas Rogers confessing, that in the yeares 1571. and 72. as also anno 1584. Epist. Ded. pag. 9. (rearmed the wofull yeare of subscription) the whole land will witnesse, that many, and sundry bookes both in Latin and English flew abroad, in which the bretheren instantly called for a Reformation of these so important errors and corruptions, but it was adiorned *ad diem*, and the day of their reformation is not yet come. I am content that none other but you Sir Humfrey your selfe, repeat euery line, and letter of this your learned Section, and when you haue done, I thinke all the world will say, that what you haue got by the bargaine, you may put in your eye, & yet see neuer a whit the worse. What shall we then say, but pittie such poore Replyers to Papists? But pray for them and say. Lord haue mercy on vs, Christ haue mercie on vs, Lord haue mercie on vs, to see the trifling of this *via Tuta*. To see the Sandiness of this Safe Way. To see the insufficiencie of Sir Humfreys Essay. To see how

fillily this childe of Truth, hath vindicated his Mothers cause, and maintayned his owne reputation, being put to proue that, which neuer Protestant could yet proue; *Where was your Church before Luther?* Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey come out with your Catalogue; especially sith your self confesse it for an *vn doubted truth*, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible professors in all ages (Epist. Ded. pag. 3.) Sith also the sacred word of God assures vs; And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors &c. vntill we meete all into the vnitie of faith: viz. vnto the end of the world. Ephes. 4. 11.

Section IV.

M*Anie learned Romanists, conuicted by eu-
dencie of Truth, ether in part, or in whole,
haue renounced Poperie before their death.*

A N S W E R.

1. What inferre you therupon? Ergo Sir Humfrey (according to promise and vndertaking) hath shewed a Catalogue of names of such Protestants, as were in all ages visible, especially in those before Luther? A Catalogue of names of such Protestants, as taught & professed in all ages, the 39. Articles

titles of his new Religion! Lord *Sir Humfrey*, when wil you satisfie the Iesuits Challenge? When will you cease to deceiue, and shew vs plainly and pertinently; *Where was your Church before Luther?*

2. But because it seemeth, you take as it were delight to trifle away the time impertinently and in sporting wise. I will, for once, imitate your idle vaine; track you, and follow your footsteps word for word, that so euen fooles may see your euident follie, and you, if hereafter you take pen in hand (as you partly promise) may learne, to guide and order him more like a scholler. I resume then your Title thus.

3. *Many learned Protestants, conuicted by the evidence of Truth, ether in part or in whole, haue renounced Protestantisme before their death.* This done, your whole Section I retort thus. How available these reasons may seeme to hinder a Reformation, I leaue to euery mans iudgment: yet sure I am, the Roman Church, hath done nothing in this, otherwise then the former Councils had anciently decreed, and diuers of estimation for pietie and learning in their owne Church, had formerly wished to be done. And I am certainly perswaded; were it not for feare of endangering the Reformed Religion (as D. King Bishop of London, rightly insinuateth, Legacy Motiue 12.) our aduersaries would come neerer vnto vs, in all the fundamentall points that our Church teacheth. For looke vpon the Communion in both kindes, and
you

you shall finde, that light of the world *Martin Luther*, aboue a hundred yeares since, did allow Communion vnder one, or both kindes, to be a thing of that indifferencie, that he saith thus herof. *Quamuis pulchrum &c* In epist. ad Bohem. Although it were very good to vse both kindes in the Eucharist, and that Christ commanded nathing herein, as necessarie, yet it were better herein to seeke after peace, then to contend touching the species or kinds. Looke vpon the restraint of priests mariages, and you shall heare learned *M. Worston* (Defence of *Master Parkins* pag. 491. Prot. Apol. pag. 76.) giue his reail assent with vs, confessing the generall receiued doctrine of the Fathers in this matter, saying therof. But the Fathers are not for vs; What then? Is nothing true, that cannot be confirmed by their testimonie? &c. Indeed it is one of the blemishes of the ancient Writers, that they were too highly conceited of single life &c. Therefore, it is not to be looked for, that Antiquitie should afford vs any testimonie herein, against the practise and iudgment of those dayes. Looke vpon priuat Masse, and of this saith *M. Harding*; The godly and faithfull people, haue much complained, but looke vpon *M. Harding* him selfe, and he tels vs quite another tale, saying: (Ans. to *Iewels Challeng* pag. 23. 24.) Every Masse is publique, and none priuat. &c. We leaue that tearme to *Luthers* schoole where it was first deuised, and so tearmed by *Satan* him selfe, seeking to withdraw his Nouice, *Luther*: speaking thus, euen in the very place which your selfe cite, and therefore to be noted for the 16. vntruth.

4. Looke now into your owne looking glasse, or let the world looke in your face, to see if you blush nor, thus to abuse that learned Doctor, to say that he, or any godly people, ever complained of priuat Masse. Looke vpon the Scriptures, and you shall find the Rem:ish Testament, translated into English, and this was done (not as you and *Causabon* vntruly charge them, til you tel vs where and therefore to be set vp for the 17.) *importunitate hereticorū*, but, the sooner to shake out of the deceived peoples hands, false hereticall Translations &c. and for the better preservation or reclaime, of many good soules endangered thereby. Rhe. Telt. pag. 2. And to conclude, Protestants haue of late granted to some men and women alio of their religion, to read their scriptures in a new translation; *King Iames* him selfe, *M. Broughton* and other learned Protestants, confessing the former to be corrupt and false; absurd, and senseles: peruerſing in very many places, the meaning of the holy Ghost. Prot. Apol. pag. 258. and this was done. *Importunitate Catholicorum*.

5. It is no wonder, that the poore widdow in the gospell, did preuaile with the corrupt Iudge, by importunitie, when such Papists as we are reputed to be, haue preuailed by importunitie, with such true Protestants, as they pretend themselves to be. Yet if we looke but within the memorie of man, we shall finde, that most of the English protestantes, did frequent our Church and diuine seruice for the first yeares of our blessed *Queene Mary*, nether was their communicating with vs forbidden

den by any lawfull English Councell. And I am verely perswaded, that many at this day in the Church of England, doe assent to our doctrine, that dare not communicat with vs openly in the Church. For sappeale to their owne consciences, how many of them, which are taught the doctrine of communicating vnder both kindes, haue wished the restoring of the former custome, to the lay people? How many with hands and hearts lifted vp, adore Christ Iesus in his bodily presence, both in heauen and earth, when the consecrated bread is presented to them vpon the Altar? How many worship the inuisible God, in spirit and truth, and withall retayne the Images for memorie, for historie, and for ornament? How many do prefer the chastitie of priests, before their leading about a sensuall sifter in the Lord, although the contraries be the common doctrine of the Church of England? Lastly, how many for feare of vaine glorie, and presumption, and by reason of the vncertaintie of their owne predestination, do labour to make their election sure by good works, & yet leaue not to rely vpon the merits of Christ Iesus? Shew me that learned man, that liueth a professed Protestant in the Church of England, and dyeth not a sound Papist in this prime foundation of our faith?

6. Thus haue I runne ouer the whole substance of this fourth Section, and shewed you of what poore stufte it is composed, when with such facilitie, it is retorted vpon your selte; when
a meere

a meere lay-man can so easlye bandy backe the whole into your owne bosome. There resteth only to speake of two or three particular persons whom you have named, that being *quondam* of our Religion, became forsooth before their death, to be of yours. You instance this in *Pighius*, in *Paulus Vergerius*, and his brother. Your Authors that confirme the same, are *Sleidan*, *Luke Osiander* and the like, our mortall enemies, and of no authoritie at all with vs; nor *Pighius*, *Paulus Vergerius*, nor his brother, nor *Sleidan*, nor *Luke Osiander* no more of your present Protestant Religion, then the Pope of Rome. Dare you to deny this? If you dare not, how poore a thing is it in you, to pretend *Pighius*, with *Paulus Vergerius* and his brother, to have dyed men of your Protestant profession, knowing (if you know ought) that we can name ten, yea twentie for one, learned and vnlearned, that vtterly forsake you to come to vs? Three learned Ministers haue this very yeare (of my knowledge) left your English Church, and are at this present here with vs, conuerted as they confessed vnto me, by the reading of our bookes. All our Colledges and English communities on this side the seas, are yearly furnished with the flower of the best wits which flow from your owne vniversities. About some fiftie, are come to one only house, within this twelue monthe, besides hundreds that are lately reconciled in England to the Catholike Church. What talke you then of three persons? Strangers to vs? and so long since? Would

I speake

I speake of strangers, how many could I name of great ranke and qualitie in France, Germanie and other contries, who partly by reading our bookes, partly by discovering the Noueltie and want of vnitie betwixt the chiefe reformed Churches, do dailie leaue you, and come to vs? So that to brag of this, or but to speake thereof, is to boast your selfe to be winners, where indeed you are the greatest losers; notwithstanding all your teachings, persecutions of our goods and persons, prohibition of our bookes, and other severities, the like whereof are no where practised by any Christians, out of the reach of your Churches rod, in all Christendome, with like frequentie, and number of sufferers for this Christian quarrell: deny this, if you dare, and yet are there added dailie to the Church; your writing of bookes to confute vs, serving to conuert them; your suppressing ours, enflaming them to finde them; all your endeouours seeking to diminish vs, serving, thorough Gods goodnesse, to nothing more then to multiply and encrease vs.

7. O strange *via Tuta*! O safe, or rather, o Sandy way! Are you the man who vndertake to make the *World* to know, that it is no difficult matter for a meere lay-man, to proue the ancient visibilitie of Protestant professors in all ages, especially in those before *Luther*? Are you the man who vndertake to answer the Iesuits Challenge? The man who vndertake to vindicate your Mothers cause, and to maintaine your owne reputation?

tion? The man who so bouldly condescend, to meete the aduersarie vpon his owne ground, and to deale with him at the same weapons, which him'selfe had chosen? The man who threaten to extorta full & ample testimony from your owne sworne enimies, to make good the visibilitie of your Church? The man, who confesse we call vpon you for a Catalogue of Protestant Names, and neuername vs so much as one, in a thousand yeares before *Luther*? Is this to proue the ancient visibilitie of Protestant professors in all ages? Is this to answer the Iesuits Challenge? Is this our owne ground? Are these our owne weapons? *Lord haue mercie vpon vs. Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs*, that you should euer thinke so to stop Papists mouthes, or so to satisfie Protestants consciences, when in no one Section, in no one page, in no one paragraphe, in no one line or leafe of your whole booke, that is to be found, or is performed, which you haue promised! Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come forth with your Catalogue, and shew vs at last; *Where was your Church before Luther*? sith your selfe confes it for an vndouted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible professors in all ages. Sith the Apostle saith in expresse rearmes; Ephes. 4. 11. *And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors &c.* to continue vntill we meet all in the vniity of faith. But to proceed to your 5. Section.

Sect.

Section V.

WOrldly policie and profit, hindreth the Reformation of such things, which are altogether inexcusable in themselves.

A N S W E R.

I. You trifle, *Sir Humfrey*, intollerably; You pretend the necessity of a Reformation: you proue it not. You may pretend, if you please, that God in making heauen and earth, with all the creatures contayned therein, committed many errors, and daylie dispute, wrangle, write, and call vnto him for a reformation. If you should do this, who can helpe it? Who can hinder it? The holy Ghost hath taken the Church into his charge, to be with hir till the end of the world, and to lead hir into all truth: the words are most expresse in S. Mat. cap. 28. Will you accuse him to haue bene carelessse of his charge? To haue neglected his government? To haue broken his promise? And to haue admitted errors into his common wealth? Is it necessarie to make choise of another witer then he, to beare the burthen of that office? Can you giue vs, can you assigne vs a better guide? Then exhibit your bill of complaint to God the Father and the Sonne, against the holy Ghost, and wrangle with him, as you doe with vs, for a Reformation.

mation. Are you a Christian? Hould you that promise of the holy Ghost? Beleeue you he hath power to performe that promise? then tate no more of the errors of the Church of Rome; wrangle no more about a Reformation; let that erroneous Church alone; & shew vs that Church guided by the holy Ghost, according to his powerfull promise, which never erred: a Church, which so perseuered in hir first forme, as that she needed no *Reformation*; sith according to your owne confession. Epist Ded. pag. 3. *It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible professors in all ages* His sacred word (lo oft recited) assureth so much. And he gaue some Apostles. and some Euangelists &c. Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, or else you trifle intollerably. Shew vs that other Sister, which alwaies kept her first faith: else all you faine besides this, is meere follie.

Sir Humfrey pag. 36.

I speake not this, as if there were hope of a Reformation in the Romish Church. For when I consider that many opinions, which formerly crept into the Church, are now established for articles of faith. When I consider, that some of their points are so linked together, that the vnloosing of one, is sometimes the losse of all. When I plainly see vpon one point of faith (namely one Purgatorie) Trentalls, Masses, Diriges, Requiems,

T

prayers

prayers for the dead, the doctrine of Merits, works of supererogation, Indulgences, Pardons, Iubillies, the power of binding and loosing; since, I say, all these attend vpon the opening and shutting of Purgatorie, and this Purgatorie is created a point of faith, and this faith is confirmed by Councils, meereley for the benefit of the Pope and his cleargie (18. *vntruth*) what hope can we haue, to get these golden keyes of Purgatory from them? By what meanes can we procure them to exercise the facultie of shutting, as well as opening: the power of binding, as well as loosing, when no man will giue mony to be bound, but to be loosed in Purgatorie?

A N S W E R.

I. For the Church of Rome, and her *Reformation*, sith it is so hopeles, let it alone, breake your head no more about it. Shew vs a Church of your owne, distinct from her, especially in the ages before *Luther*, of the same *forme*, of the same mould and making that yours is: so agreeable to her first *forme*, that she neuer needed *Reformation*. Shew vs once a true *formation* of your Church according to the Iesuites Challenge, and then we will heare your tale of a *Reformation*. Shew vs that; tell vs no more of this, else you trifle intolerably.

Sir Humfrey pag. 36.

When I consider, that many opinions, which formerly crept into the Church, are now established

A N S W E R.

Of this point I haue spoken before sufficiently pag. 199. I haue proued that the Church hath this power. I haue proued that your owne church, hath practised this very power in your 39. English Articles: some wherof were ancient heresies, formerly crept into the Church, and for such condemned by her generall Councils, how answer you this?

Sir Humfrey pag. ibid.

When I consider that some of their points are so lincked together, that the vnloosing of one, is sometimes the losse of all.

A N S W E R.

1. To this I answer, it is most true, not only in *some of our points*, but in all, and euery point deliuered by her for matter of faith; wherein this linke of vnitie and dependance must to be found, that he that vnlinketh one, vnlinketh all: he that vnlooseth one, vnlooseth all: *he that sinneth in one, transgresseth in all*, saith the Apostle: Is it otherwise in your Religion? May a man deny one or more points, yet troulding the rest, be still a Protestant? What linking is then in your Religion? How vnloose is it? How lost is all their labour that linck them selues vnto the same? You make me sorie to see you dispute so loosely, and so vnlearnedly.

Sir Humfrey pag. ibid & 37.

When I plainly see vpon one point of faith (namely, one Purgatorie, Trentalls, Masses, Diriges, Requiems, Prayers for the Dead, the doctrine of Merits, workes of Supererogation, Indulgences, Pardons, Iubilies, the power of Binding and Loosing:) since, I say, all these attend vpon the opening, and shutting of Purgatorie, and this Purgatorie, is created a point of faith, and this faith confirmed by a Councell, meerly for the benefit of the Pope and his Cleargie, what hope can we haue, to get these golden keyes of Purgatory from them?

A N S W E R.

1. To all this I answer thus. For denying Purgatory, Prayers for the dead, Merit of good works the power of Binding and Loosing, and the like, you ranke your selfe with Aetius for the first; with Iouinian for the second; with Nouatus for the third; all for this very cause, anciently condemned as hereticks. For all the rest, take your answer out of your selfe, pag. 3. *The 12. Articles, the Ten commandments, and some few of the Sacraments, are simply necessary and profitable for all men; the rest are such as a man may be saued without them.* See you not, how the Spider spinnes much, and profits little, when her whole webbe, is so easily brusht, and swept away?

2. Againe, to retort your owne wordes vpon your selfe, may not I say to you? *When I plainly*
see,

ses, vpon one point of Protestant faith (namely deni-
 all of Purgatorie) Trentalls, Masses, Diriges, Requiems,
 Prayer for the dead, Merits Works of Supererogation,
 Indulgences, Pardons, Iubilies, Binding loosing and
 thelike, all to attend vpon the opening and shutting of
 Purgatorie; and this deni-
 all of Purgatorie, created a
 point of Protestant faith; and this faith confirmed by
 act of Parlament, meerly for the benefit of Ministers
 and their brats, Which otherwise might begge their
 bread. Neuer a Chappell in all England, nor endued
 With rich donations for prayers of the soules departed,
 What hope can we haue to get these golden keyes of Pur-
 gatorie from them? By what meanes can we procure
 them, to exercise the facultie of opening, as well as
 shutting Purgatorie, When no man will giue mony to
 his brats goe a begging; Purgatorie being the cub-
 bard, from whence they and theirs pick vp their
 crummes, else thousands of them might starue for
 hungar? Is this the man? Is the booke, wherto it
 will trouble our whole colledge, to returne an
 answer? O the emptie bragging! o the deceitfull
 boasting! o the penurie of Protestants pressed to
 proue; Where was your Church before Luther? To
 goe forward, you say.

Sir Humfrey pag. 38.

When, I say, our Religion is directly and im-
 mediately deriued from the Scripture (19. *vn-truth.*)
 When our doctrine agreeth in the fundamentall
 points, with S. Augustin and the Fathers (20. *vn-*
truth.) When the primitive and Reformed Churches,

ches, haue shaken hands together, is it not a meere malice, to oppose a knowen ancient doctrine, and to make a league against God and his word? against the true Religion and her Church? &c. It cannot be denyed, that this is the common practise of the Roman Church (21. *vntruth.*) For otherwise, what man in his right senses, would take vpon him to be wiser then God? &c.

A N S W E R.

1. True *Sir Humfrey*; but were you in your right senses when you wrote this, euery word whereof may be thus retorted vpon your selfe? Take them then retorted thus. When, I say, our Papist Religion, is directly and immediatly deriued from the Scripture; When our Papist doctrine, agreeeth in the fundamentall points with *S. Austen*, and the Fathers; When the primitiue, and Papist Churches, haue shaken handes together, is it not meere malice in Protestants, to oppose an ancient knowen doctrine, and to make a league against God and his word, against the true Religion and her Church? Yet it cannot be denyed, that this is the common practise of the English Church: for otherwise what man in his right senses, would take vpon him to be wiser then God? Lord what imbecillitie! Lord what beggerie! Lord what deceit and pouertie in such proceeding!

2. After this you descend to sundry particulars, most wherof (for lack of better matter) you had repeated before, as, that of our leaving out the

the second cōmandment, taking the Cup (which you loue so much) from the laity, of seruice in the Latin tongue, and the like: and so steale away, and trifle out the time in speaking of points of profession disputed betwixt vs and you, instead of producing the promised professors of those that held the points them selues. What is this, as I said before, but to lay a false foundation, and then to build therō mighty Castles in your owne conceit? To beg as true, and to take as granted, that which principally you should haue proued? For neuer while breath is in your body, will we grant, that Protestant Religion, wherein it dissenteth from vs, is directly deriued from the Scripture. Nor their doctrine to agree in fundamentall points with *S. Austen* and the Fathers. Nor the Primitiue, and the Reformed Churches to haue shaken handes together. All these nor any one of these, will we grant you *Sir Humfrey* vpon your bare suppposall, no more then we will grant the same to *Æerius*, *Donatus*, *Nonatus*, or any other ancient or moderne hereticks, should they pretend the same you do, and bring no proofes, but their bare suppposalls.

3. We are now at the end of your fift Section In these fise Sectiōs, you haue touched these sundry things. The primacie of the Pope. Merit of good works. Traditions. Nothing but scripture to be the sole Rule of faith. Worship of Images. Inuocation of Saints. Consecration and Adoration of the Sacrament of the Altar, priuate Masse

(as you please to speake.) Latin service. Communion in one kinde. Mariage of Priests. Purgatorie, and prayer for the Dead. The power of binding and loosing sinnes. Against all these you conclude thus in the last page of this fift Section. *What foolishnes is it for a mā to rely vpon the Church, Which is the authoritie of man that may erre, When he may build vpon the infallible Rule of Gods Word, Which as is agreed on all hands, cannot erre? As though for all these points (and many more by me omitted) you had forsooth the infallible Rule of Gods Word; nether you, nor any other, far better learned then you selfe, nor all the Protestants alieue, though put together, being able to proue al these, nor one halfe of these, expressely out of that infallible Rule, or primitive fathers wherof notwithstanding you so presume. Which considered, I will here (as often before) close vp this Section retorting vpon you your owne words. What madnesse? What stupiditie? What foolishnes is it for a man to relye vpon the Church of Protestants, Which is the authoritie of man that may erre, When he may build vpon the infallible Rule of Gods Word in the Catholique Church, which cannot erre? If men for the aduantage of their cause, or for their owne preferment, Will by shifts and cauills, turne the necks of Scripture and Fathers cleane about, and wrest them to their owne side, let them beware of their example, Who could not belecue: or if they did beleue, durst not confesse Christ, becaule they sought the praise of men, more then the praise of God. Iohn. 5. 44.*

4. I am wearie Sir Humfrey to see your weaknes, and wonder much if your selfe be not ashamed of so great shallownes, who are able to bring nothing against vs, but what is so easilie beaten back into you owne faces. Fye for shame, that euer this *Via Tuta* of yours, should bee reprimed the fourth time! Fye for shame, that Protestants, perusing the same, are not able at the first view, to discover the desperatnes of such a cause, the povertie of such replies, the evident deceit of such proceedings! Where are their witts? Where are their senses? What is become of their vnderstanding? *Eyes they haue and see not, eares they haue and heare not, their foolish hart is blinded,* hat hearing vs so often call vpon them. *Where was your Church before Luther?* That leing your selte iugeniously confesse; *It is an vndouted truth, and subscribed vnto by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages* Seeing Truth it selfe so expressly to teache; And he gaue some Apostles and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue vntil wee meete all in the vnitie of faith, haue not, will not, nor possibly cannot produce or name, so much as one only Protestant, especially in the ages before *Luther*, euen for a thousand yeares and vpwards, and yet forsooth, bee led by the nose, and be so simple, as to beleue, that there were euen thousands such, and as thick sown in those former ages, as they are in these? O happy pastors, that feede a people so prompt

prompt to belecue! O wonderfull praise of the blind obedience and implicit faith of such simple sheepe! Our Sauour exclaimes of his Disciples Luc. 24. 25. saying. *O foolish, and slow of hart to beleue in all things which the Prophets haue spoken!* but contrariwile, we may exclaime and say of our present Protestants. O foolish, and too forward of hart to beleue in all things, that wherof neuer Prophet spoke, neuer historie recounts, neuer man (dead or alieue) makes any mencion! Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, if euer you intend to stop our mouthes, or to acquit your selues of the cryme we lay to your charg. But me thinks, after so many Sections and words spent in wast, you begin at last to come to the matter, and to speake somewhat to the purpose, for your next Section beginneth thus.

Section V I.

THe comon pretence of our aduersaries, refusing Reformation, because, we cannot assigne the precise Time when errors came in, Refuted.

A N S W E R.

1. You tell vs a tale of an ould Tubbe, a plaine tale of *Dassa-downe Dillie*, when you tell vs a tale of Reformation. We aske, we seeke, we enquire

quire after no Church which needeth any *Reformation* at all, in matters of faith. Let all such Churches goe: shew vs that Church, which from the Apostles vnto vs was so well in order, and so well *Formed*, as that she needed no *Reformation*. Remember still your owne words. Epist. ded. pag. 3. *It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages.* Shew vs that Church: those visible professors then, in all ages. Why stay you, why delay you, why spend you the time in other vaine and needles talke? We cry to you, wee call to you whilst we are hoarse, for a *Reformation* of this fault (so frequently committed by you) which yet we cannot get you to *Reforme*; You must either *Reforme* it here, or we haue litle hope that you are those *Reformers*, which yet you would bee held to bee.

Sir Humfrey pag. 45.

How far the Church of Rome stands guilty of this cryme, I will not take vpon me to censure; but sure I am, they are so far from reforming the abuses, and errors in their Church, that they will not acknowledge their points of Doctrine to bee erroneous, vnlesse we can assigne the time, and point at the persons who first broached them. Now since we are all eye-witnesses, that the errors of the Romish Church, are at this day so notorious, that a very child may perceine them, it were

were more fift (as I conceiue) to redeeme the time by correcting those errors, that crept into the Church, then to enquire after times and persons, which are not in their hands.

A N S W E R.

1. Here you vse yourould tricks to flinck away, and deceiue the simple. You tell vs of the Church of Rome, and of her *Errors* (which we at present aske not after) and tell vs not of that *Vnerring* Church, which we aske after. You tell vs of the great desire you haue of her *Reformation*, and tells vs not where we shall find her that needed none, but kept her selfe in hir first faith without any spot of cōtamination. You lay a false foundation, and then (within your owne braine) build ayeriall Castles thereon, which yet to your thinking, far ouertop the Tower of Babel. *You are sure, you are all eye witnesses of the errors of the Church of Rome: They are so notorious, as a childe may perceiue them:* Itill changing the state of the question, from the *persons* of the faithfull, to their faith: from the professors, to the particular points of their profession; Still miserably begging; Still poorely pretending that as granted, which principally you ought to haue proued. Will you iustifie your owne Church? shew the Catalogue of her professors. Will you oppose ours? Assigne the precise time when errors entred first into her: else these in very deed, are fit royes and bables for the children you speake of, to sport withall, not with men

men of sufficient maturitie to be satisfied with all.

2. Your instances to confirme your fancies, of one sick of a Consumption: and of shewing the Time, and occasion, *how*, and *when* his lunges became *first* infected. What post or principall, did *first* decay in a rotten houle. Of one falling into a pit, and calling for helpe *how* to get out, neuer asking the question *how* he came in, to speake sparingly of them, are all impertinent, and from the purpose, deserving no place at all in this dispute: but to baptise them according to their desert, or plaine blasphemies against the holy Ghost; vnlesse you can proue God the holy Ghost (who hath taken vpon him the gouernement of the Church) to haue fallen sick of a Consumption of the Lungs, when he should haue looked to his charge. Or to haue built a house, whereof the principall posts or peeces, were ready to rot, and to fall to ruine, if you and your fellowes, had not presently put to your helping handes to hould it vp. Or that in leading the Church (belike by night, without Candle or Lanterne) he let her fall into a ditch. Or according to your last example, fell a sleepe, whilst the enimies sowed the Tares. All this, I say presupposed, then indeed were there reason to say. If he fell a sleepe, how could he see them? If he did not see them, how could he produce them?

3. What a drowisie dreame, what a sleepe supposition call we this, so directly contrary to sacred scripture, assuring vs that the holy Ghost, not
only

only in his owne person, but by his order and appointment, hath set his ouer-seers in his Church Ilay 62.6. saying. Upon thy walles Ierusalem, I haue appointed watchmen, all the day and all the night, for euer they shall not bould their peace. To this purpose also the Prophet Ieremie. cap. 33. 20. Thus saith our Lord; If my couenant with the day can be made voide, and my couenant with the night, that there be not day and night in their time, also my couenant may be made voide, with Dauid my seruant, that there be not of him a Sonne in his throane, & Leuits and Priests my ministers. Euen as the Starres of heauen cannot be numbred, and the sand of the sea be measured so will I multiplie the seed of Dauid my seruant. That al'o of the Prophet Daniel, laying. In the dayes of those kingdomes, the God of heauen will raise vp a kingdom, that shall not be dissipated for euer, and his kingdom shall not be deliuered to another people, and it shall breake in peeces and shall consume all these kingdomes, and it selfe shall stand foreuer.

4. These places of holy Scripture presupposed, how weake and poore are your pretensions of the rotting and ruine of this eternall house? How impertinent your supposition of mens falling a sleepe, whilst the Tares of such notorious errors were sown in this pure field? Of the Lungs of the mysticall body of Iesw Christ, falling into a dangerous consumption, Of the Churches falling into a ditch, and the like? You who erst bragged so of pure scripture, proue vnto vs out of scripture that this was euer ment, or veresied of the whole Church.

Church? By this you plainly discover, what sick-
lie and rotten shifts you are forced to finde, when
you are vrged to shew the Time, ether when er-
rors first entred into our Church: or to answer
our demand. *Where was your Church before Lu-
ther?*

Next, you distinguish errors, into errors at first
not easily espied; and afterwards become *known* er-
rors, wherof the seruants make complaint to their
Master, saying. *Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in
thy field? From whence then hath it Tares? Of these
later you say thus.*

Sir Humfrey pag. 48.

We say therefore, that in the primitiue Church,
when any heresie did arise, that indangered the
foundation, or openly disturbed the Church, such
as was the heresie of the Arians, of the Pelagians,
of the Donarists, and the like, the first Authors
were obserued, the times were knowen, the place
was pointed at, and forthwith letters of Aduer-
tisement or Premonition, were written (which
were then in vse) and were sent by the Orthodox
Bishops and Pastors, to other parts, and sound
members of the Catholique Church; By which
publique notice, the Steale-truth was discovered,
and after publication of his heresie, the party was
repressed, and excluded from the Communion
of the whole Church, And in this alteration and
change of Doctrine, Bellarmines Reason may
take place: that is. *In every great and notorious mu-
tation*

tation, there may be obserued the Author, 'the Time, and the Place. the Beginnings, Increasings, and the Resistances made against it. But the change of the Romish doctrine was otherwise &c. It was a secret Apostasie, a falling away from the Truth &c. *Sensim sine sensu*, vnlesible and vnawarres.

A N S W E R.

1. To this, I answer. If the Change of the Romish doctrine were at the first not in that open, but in this secret manner, as you suppose, then it was not an euident heresie, that did presently endanger the foundation of faith, or openly disturbe the peace of the Church. Then was it not such as that of the Arians, Pelagians and the like: but so secret, as whereof no first Author was obserued. The time was vnknown. The Place was not pointed at: nor letters of Premonition, written or sent against her by Orthodox Bishops into other parts: nor she repressed and excluded from the Communion of the whole Church. Marke well, I pray this prettie tale of your owne telling; and tell vs next, how long she continued in this state? When? in what age? in what place, contrie, cittie, or Church? Of whom? vnder what Pope, Emperour, or Prince, she was first noted by any of yours, to practise publicquely that spirituall fornication you haue laid to her charge? pag. 3. To haue gone a Whoring after her owne inuentions; to haue plaid the Harlot, and to haue committed manifest and manifest Idolatry? For this you are bound to doe by

by your owne Rule, when the Idolatrie was no more in *secret*, when the error became a *known* error, and the good Protestant corne, was *endangered* by the Papisticall Tares, Who, I pray, were those Protestant seruants, who first made complaint to their Master, saying. *Sir didst thou not sow good seede in thy field, from whence then bath it Tares?* What their names? What the Masters name, the complaint was first made vnto? How cal you your Orthodox Bishops, which forthwith dispatched their *letters of Aduertisement* or Premonition, to other parts and sound members of the Church else where? In what age liued they? In what place or contrie? What were the contents of those Premonitorie *letters*? Which were those other parts and sound members of the Church they were sent vnto, especially in the ages before *Luther*? especiallie then when *ye* were all *eye-witnesses*, that the errors of the Romish Church were so notorious, that a very childe might perceiue them? If you cannot assigne the precise time of such *manifest* and *manifest* Idolatrie, of such errors, wherof you were all *eye-witnesses*, and so *notorious* that a verie childe might perceiue them, then are you *manifest* deceiuers, *manifest* calumniators, witnesses whose very eyes are not to be beleeued, and a very child may perceiue the pouertie and beggerie of your cause, when either you are vrged to name the *Time*, when errors first entred into our Church, or put to proue, *Where was your Church before Luther?*

Sir Humfrey pag. 51.

It is an undeniable truth, that some opinions were condemned in the primitive Church for erroneous and superstitious, which now are established for Articles of faith in the Roman Church. To give an instance: S. Austin complains that in his Time, the rude sort of people were intangled with superstition, even in the Church: *My selfe (saith he) know many that are worshippers of Tombes and Pictures. Whom the Church condemneth and seekes every day by correction to amend the as yngratious children.* This holy Father complains of some people in his dayes, which became superstitious in worshiping of Images, whom the Church did then condemn as corrupters of true Religion. The Authors of this error, he nameth not; The time when it began, he sheweth not; notwithstanding, we are all eye-witnesses, that this corruption hath got the vpper hand: and that which was then condemned by S. Austin and the Church for superstition, was confirmed foure hundred yeares after, by the second Councell of Nice for Catholique Doctrine; and is now decreed by the Councell of Trent, for an Article of faith.

A N S W E R.

1. I pittie you, *Sir Humfrey*, I condole your distresse, I bewayle your want, when you are put to produce your Protestant progenitors, before *Luther*. What I pray, was the state of the question? What the Iesuits Challenge made

made vnto you? Was it, That Sir Humfrey or his friends, should proue out of some good Authors, that the Papist, or the Protestant Church was visible in all ages? Was it to know the errors of the Church of Rome, or those of the Church of England? Fye vpon such flinching. Fye vpon such fraud. Fye vpon such tricks of tergiuersation, which euery childe is able to discover.

2. Besides, you haue committed (Sir Humfrey) almost as many lourd faults in this answer, as there are lines. 1. You say; It is an vdeniable truth: this is one. That some opinions were condemned in the Primitiue Church, which now are established for Articles of faith in the Roman: this is two. 3. You bring an instance out of S. Austin, whose minde you abuse most shamefully: this is three. 4. The particulars, are, *Worshippers of Tombes and Pictures*, which, as you say, the Church of that time did condemne, this is four. 5. That the *ruder sort* only was intangled with this Superstition; what fault then was this in the whole Church? this is five. 6. That this holy Father (S. Austin) complained of some in his dayes, for worshipping of Tombes and Pictures as we do now; then complained he of him selfe, who of the first saith thus: Tom. 3. de Ecclesi. dog. cap. 73. initio. *If any oppose this opinion, he is not to be thought a Christian, but an Eunomian and Vigilantian* (so two of your Protestant predecessors.) This is six 7. Concerning pictures, and their worship, he mencioneth the making and seeing in particular, of (a) Tom.

4. de consensu euang. l. 1. cap. 10. that of Christ, of S. Peter, and S. Paul, libro contra Faust. 22. cap. 73. of Abraham offering Isaac, as set vp in sundry places. And of their worship hee saith thus. Tom. 3. de Doct. Christ. lib. 3. capite 9. initio. *The honor giuen vnto profitable signes appointed by God, passeth from them to the thing signified: this therefore is seauen.* 8. *That the Author of this error, he nameth not: yet he toucheth some by name, and particularly his owne mother (but we shall see hereafter for what it was:) this is eight* 9. *That the Time when it began, he sheweth not: it sufficeth by your owne confession, that S. Austin complaines it was in his Time. And who knowes not the Time wherein S. Austin liued? this is nine.* 10. *That you are eye-witnesses that This corruption hath got the vpper hand: for it was not this, as I shall plainly make appeare, but a corruption quite of another nature: this is ten.* 11. *That which was then condemned by S. Austin and the Church for superstition, was confirmed 400. yeares after by the Councel of Nice: which were to make the Church in a generall Councell, to condemne her selfe; this eleuen.* 12. *That it is now decreed by the Councel of Trent for an Article of faith: so was it then as much as now, besides that you make the same 800. yeares old: this is twelue.* Loe, how many faults you haue committed, Sir *Humfrey* in so few lines? Lo how insufficiently you haue set forth the Essay of your endeauours, vindicated your Mothers cause, and maintained your
 OWNE

owne Reputation, not otherwise then by multiplying *Vntruths*. Vntill you come at least to the number of 30.

3. All that followes after to the end, being of points of controuersie already so often repeated without any prooffe (as, *Peters Primacie*, prayers to Saints, prayers for the departed, merit of workes, and the seauen Sacraments) nothing brought against them out of expresse Scripture; the Authors to confirme them, being ether knowen enemies of the Catholique cause, or of no Antiquitie (as *Ferus* the Friar, *Marius*, *Erasmus*, *Polydore*, *Cassander* and the like;) all or most of those points, hauing beene of much more antiquitie then you allow them (as hath beene proued against *Master Preston*;) it being quite from the purpose of that you were to proue, according to promise, and which, if granted to you *are such, as a man be saued without them* pag. 3. how vaine is your vaunt, that you would make the world to know, that what you vndertooke, was *no difficult matter*? That you would vindicat your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation? That you would meete the aduersarie vpon his owne ground? Deale with him at his owne weapons? Extort an ample testimonie from him selfe, to make good the visibilitie of your Church? In a word, not performing the left point of your promise, or of that which was expected of you, you oppine to stop our mouthes with such fond fables, and to appease vs with such childish bables instead of she-

wing vs, Where was your Church before Luther? Your Catalogue Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue. Singe once vnto vs with the Prophet David Psalm. 44. For thy Fathers, there are borne Sonnes to thee, thou shalt make them princes ouer all the earth: they shall bee mindfull of thy name in all generation and generation. And againe with the same Prophet: Psal. 99. Praise yee his name because our Lord is sweet: his mercie for euer, and his truth, euen vnto generation and generation. Sing vnto vs with the virgin Marie. Luc. 1, Because hee that is mightie hath done great things to me, and holy is his name, and his mercie from generatiō vnto generations. Or if you cannot sing, then say vnto vs with S. Mathew. The booke of the generation of the ministers of Iesus Christ. Luther begat Melancthon; Melancthon begat Caluin, Caluin begat Zuinglius, Zuinglius begat Beza, Beza begat Bucer, Bucer begat Ochine, Ochine begat Carlostadius, Carlostadius begat Iohn Huse (otherwise called Iohn Goose) & so in order. sith your selfe assure vs Epist. Ded. pag. 3. that It is an vndouted truth, and subscribed vnto by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all ages; sith his sacred word it selfe doth likewise assure vs. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. Vntill wee meete all into the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11. You that hungre so greatly after scripture, haue you here your bellie full?

Section VII.

THe Pedegree of the Romish faith, drawen downe from the ancient Hereticques, and the Protestant faith deriued from Christ and his Apostles.

A N S W E R.

1. And can you, Sir Humfrey, in sober sadnesse, shew vs the *pedegree* of the Romish faith, drawen downe from anciēt Hereticques, and cannot shew vs the *Pedegree* of the English faith, drawen from anciēt Catholiques! Well to please you for once, we will become your patient spectators, and expect this so much desired *Extraction*, of all the world. Perhaps at last you will produce your blessed *Genealogie* and *Generation*.

Sir Humfrey pag. 61.

But since these men are so inquisitiue, to know of vs the first Authors of their Religion, I will tell them of their predecessors, and giue them a short *Pedegree*, both of the Roman faith, and our Protestant doctrine, that it may appeare from whom they, and we, are lineally descended. And first, touching the succession in person & Doctrine, I will examine it, *ordine retrogrado* by ascending vppward.

ANSWER.

1. You erre wittingly; you mistake maliciously, you deale deceitfully. You still change the state of the question. We are not inquisitive to know of you, the first authors of our Religion. Wee know them well enough without you. Wee knew them longe before we knew you. We knew them better then you know your owne. We are inquisitive to know the first Authors, or Author of your Religion. The Time, when hee liued? The Place, where? The Author, who? His Doctrine, what? The beginning, Encreasing, and Resistance made against it. Neuer came there any Religion into the world without these Markes. Christs owne Religion doth answer to them euery one. No notorius mutation or innouation can be possibly made, but all these circumstances must needes cōcurre. That Anciēt *Vincentius Lirinēsis* 1200. yeares agoe, in his *Goldē treatise* (Cap. 14.) tells thus: *To say the truth, What heresie hath ever peeped forth, but vnder the name of some certaine Man; in some certaine Place; at some certaine Time?* we speake in this place of a notorious mutation, whether in yours, or in ours, both which are notorious. Tel vs not now, that you cannot assigne the Time, nor point at the Persons that first broached them, because such Steale-truthes came at vnaduaies and in the night season, when there was none so much as dreams of them: because it is a myste-rie, and we know mysteries are secret; working cunningly

ningly and warilie to auoide discoueries. If you shew vs not your *owne* pedegree : if you shew vs not a Church of yours, distinct from that of the Roman; that was Protestant fully, in all points : *purely*, without any mixture of damnable error : *orderly*, vnder lawfull guides and Pastors : *perpetually*, without the note of manifest change, then shall we hould you for the *Steale-truths* that you speake of, yet not coming, so at vnwares, nor in the night, nor in so secret a mysterie, nor working so cunningly nor so warilie, but we shall discover you. To proceed therefore to your Pedegree of the Romish Church, in *Person*, and *Doctrime*.

Sir Humfrey pag. 62. &c.

Latin seruice, and prayer in a strange tongue, came into the Church (*31. Vntruth.*) by Pope Vitalian (saith Wolphius) anno 660. *from the heretiques* Ossen. *From the* Corinthians in the Apostles times &c. Transubstantiation was first decreed at the councell of Lateran, about 400. yeares agoe. *Before that set on foote by* Damascen and Epiphanius the deacon. *Before that,* by the Helcesaitæ. *Before that by* Marcus the heretique, *and by the* Caphernaits. &c. The popes Supremacie, was confirmed, at the conncell of Lateran. *Before that by* Phocas the Emperor 600. yeares after Christ. *Before that from the* Gentils &c. The worship of Images, was decreed at the 2. council of Nice, almost 800. yeares after Christ. *Before that the* Basilidians, and Carpocratians in
the

the primitive times, did worship Images &c. The Communion in one kinde, was decreed in the councill of Constance, about 1400. yeares after Christ &c. By the Maniches &c. By the Nazarits in the Apostles times &c. Of Inuocation of Saints and Angels, their founders were the hereticks Angelici &c. (i. 2. *Vntruth.*) Of merits and works of Superogation, the Cathari, the Puritans. Of worshiping the B. Virgin, the Collydrians &c. Of restraint of Priests mariage, the heretique Tatianus, and the Maniches.

A N S W E R.

1. Thus haue you, *Sir Humfrey*, taken the paines, to delineat the Pedegree of the Romish faith, both in *Person*, and *Doctrine*, from the ancient heretiques. You haue toold vs the Tenets. You haue shewed vs their Antiquitie. You haue particularised their Authors. You haue recounted sundry Councelles that did confirme many of them. Now, how fit was this place, and how faire an occasion was offred vnto you, to doe the like for your owne Religion? Why did you not as well name the *Persons* (those stout and worthy Protestât Prelats) who, when Pope *Vitalian*, about a thousand yeares agoe, set vp the Latin service. opposed him; and stood for the English? The *Persons*. who 400. yeares agoe, opposed the Councell of Lateran about Transubstantiation, and stood for the substance of bread in the Sacramēt? The *Persons*, that opposed *Phocas* the Emperor about

about the Popes Supremacie 600. yeares after Christ, and stood for that of the temporall prince, or equalitie of Bishops or Superintendencie? The *Persons*, who 800. yeares after Christ, opposed the 2. councell of Nice about the worship of Images, and defended thē who broke or burnt them? The *Persons* of thole that oppoled the council of Constance about Communion vnder one kinde, and stood stoutly to it, that it was the breach of Christs institution, vnles it were administered to all alike vnder both? Especially sith your owne wordes confes as much, laing. *It is an yndouted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all ages*? epist. ded. pag. 3. Especially sith the word of God telleth vs so plainly, *And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. till wee meete all in the vnitie of faith*? Ephes. 4. 11.

2. Now this being so, and you hauing numbered here no lesse then *Ten* seuerall points of our Religion, which you so mainly oppose, how comes it to passe, that naming both the *Persons* that defended ours, the seuerall points and ages also wherein they were confirmed, you name no persons at all, not so much as only one (after Christ and his Apostles) that defended yours, and opposed ours? Nor any age, nor any Author, nor any Councell, that confirmed those points of your English faith? Here the lapwing, hath bewrayd

wrayd her owne nest. Here the craft of our Re-
forming Protestants is discouered. Here their de-
ceitfull dealing is descried. Here deuising how
to damnisie the Roman Church, you haue prickt,
you haue perced, you haue wounded your En-
glish mother vnto death. If you had had any pre-
decessor before *Lutber*, doubtlesse here you would
haue produced him. Which not hauing done,
vnanswerable is this demand of ours to all Prote-
stants whatsoeuer. *Where was your Church before
Lutber?* Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out
with your Catalogue, which till you performe,
neuer expect that ether Papiests mouths will bee
stopped, nor Protestants consciences thoroughly
satisfied.

¶ 3. But to requite your kindnes; to meete
you vpon your owne ground; to deale with
you at your owne weapons and to retort
your sillie shift vpon your selfe, I will likewise
(and that with much more truth then you haue
done) produce the Pedegree of your English faith,
and shew your successio, both in *Person* & *Doctri-
ne* (if at least you haue any in *Person*) to be indeed
descended from ancient Heretiques, I will pro-
duce I say (seeing you haue not done it) your true
Pedegree, euen in the selfe same points, whereof
you accuse vs of superstition, heresse, and Idola-
trie: we shall wishe to see how handsomlie you
will walsh your handes of this imputation; The
rather for that the same was laid to the charge of
Protestants long since by that learned *Stapleton*, in
his

his Discourse vpon their Doctrine pag. 175. to which for breuitie sake I remit you. Meane while, I would be glad to heare, what you say to this that followes?

4. The *Arrians* (to vse *S. Aug.* words) thought it vnlawfull, to pray, or offer sacrifice for the dead. lib. de hæres. cap. 33. for which they were condemned, so do you.

The *Donatists*, implacably hated the Bishop of Rome: called his seate the *Chaire of pestilence*, & the like: so do you calling him *Antechrist*; hir, *Whore*, *harlot*, and the malignant Church pag. 5.

The *Maniches* denied the *Reall presence*, as also a true visible Sacrifice in the Church of Christ, as witnesseth Theod. dial. 3. *S. Hierom* epist. ad *Hedibian*. So do you.

Vigilius denied prayers to *Saints*, and maintayned the marriage of *Priests*, as witnesseth *S. Hierom* lib. cont. *Vigil.* and in 1. Cor. 9. So do you.

Simon Magnus, tearmed the power of doing *Miracles*, *lugling impostures*, as *S. Ireneus* witnesseth: so do you.

The *Ebionits* accounted many of those bookes for *Apocryphall*, which the Church accounteth for *Cânonicall*, as *Epiphanius* witnesseth: so do you.

The *Novatians* denied that Christ had conferred power to man to forgive sinnes, as *Baronius* pro-ueth an. 254. n. 107: so do you.

The *Manichees* denied *Free Will*, witnessed by *Alphonſ. a Castro* verbo *Libertas* Hær. 1. so do you.

The *Donatists* hated and contemned sacred
Chryſme,

Chrysostome, so do you.

The *Arrians* held, that *Generall Councils* could erre, so do you.

The *Luciferans* charged the Ancient Church with *apostacie*, as *S. Hierom* witnesseth, so do you.

Iovinian denyed the merit of good workes, as the same *S. Hierom* noteth lib. 1. & 2. cont. *Iovinian*, so do you.

Vigilius (whom *S. Hierom* calleth *Dormitanus*) inueighed against burning of *Candles* in the Church, *Vigils* of Saints, and visiting their *sepulchres*, and *vowes* of virginitie, as he testifieth; so do you.

Nestorius set at nought all the *Fathers* and *Doctors* of the Church, preferring his owne exposition and fancie before them all, as *Socrates* lib. 7. cap. 32. testifieth, so do you. *Xenaias* was the first, saith *Nicephorus*, that cast out this wicked speeche, the Image of *Christ* and of those that pleased him must not be worshipped: as right a *Protestas* as if he were spit out of his mouth.

The *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* was denyed by *Wickliffe*; for which his bones were afterwards burnt.

4. Lo, *Sir Humfrey*, the true *Protestant* list, and *Catalogue*, both in *Person* and *Doctrinè*, which you haue so long concealed from vs: the generation and loynes, from which indeed you are descended: the true *bosome*, wherein your Church was so long since lodged: the true genealogie and badge of your branded bretheren, ether accounted

ted of all good men, in the Ages they liued in, for wicked hereticks, condemned for such by holie Councils, or burnt to Ashes for their heresie. I haue briefly repeated here, many seuerall points of our Religion, all those, for the most part, which you oppose: shew me now the precise Time, when any of these first entred into the Church, at least (according to your owne Rule) when the *Mutation* and *Opposition*, was notorious? The contrie or Place, where it was? The *Authors name*, that first broached them? And those Orthodox Protestant Fathers which did *Oppose* them? Shew me, I say;

1. that to haue the seruice in the Latine tongue.
2. to worship Images.
3. to honor Reliques
4. to visit the tombes of Martirs.
5. to goe in pilgrimage to holy places.
6. to acknowledge the Popes primacie.
7. The Real presence.
8. Transubstantiation.
9. the masse to be a sacrifice.
10. Purgatorie.
11. prayer for the dead.
12. the prescribed fasts.
13. the vse of holy Candles, holy oyle, holy ashes.
14. The Church to haue Apostated.
15. vowes of Chastitie.
16. the life of Monkes, and Nunnes.
17. their profession of pouertie.
18. Confirmation.
19. Penance.
20. Orders.
21. Mariage.
22. Extreame-unction to be no Sacrament.
23. Prayers to Saints.
24. Miracles.
25. power to forgiue sinnes.
26. free will.
27. the erring of Generall Councils.
28. merit of good workes.
29. lawfulness of Priests marriages.
30. the bookes of Scripture we defend against you for not Apocryphall.

Shew me, I say, the precise Time, when any of these first entred into the

the

the Church, with notorious *Mutation* on our side, and notorious *Opposition* on yours? Shew me, that ether the houlders or practisers of all, or any these points (in the same sense that we do) were accounted of any good men, in the Ages they liued in, for wicked hereticks, condemned for such by holy Councils, or burnt to ashes for their heresie? If you cannot do this, you may not accuse vs. You are caught, *Sir Humfrey* in your owne words. In euery great and notorious *Mutation*, there may be obserued the *Author*, the *Time*, and the *Place*, the *Beginnings*, *Increasings*, and the *Resistance* made against it. pag. 5. which neuer hauing done, nor neuer being able to doe, you are neuer able to answer the *Iesuits* Challenge, nor our demand. Where was your Church before *Luther*?

Section VIII.

THe testimonies of our *Aduersaries*, touching the *Antiquitie* and *vniversalitie* of the *Protestant* faith in *Generall*.

A N S W E R.

In the precedent Section, when you could not shew the *Pedegree* of your owne *English* faith drawn from the *Ancient* and *Orthodox* *Catholiques*, you would needes vndertake to shew vs the *Pedegree* of our *Romish* faith, drawn from
the

the Ancient heretiques. Here in this Section, ha-
uing no testimonie at all touching the Antiquitie
and vniuersallitie of the *Persons* of any Protestants
nether from your selues, nor yet from vs, after your
deceitfull maner, you haue recourse to vs for our
testimonie, of the Antiquitie and Vniuersallitie of
your *Faith*, still most ignorantly, or rather most
wilfully and guilefully, declining the Challenge
and state of the question, which neuer vrged any
testimonies of your faith or profession, but of your
faithfull: but of your professors. It is a hell to vp-
right mindes, to be drawn to the view of such
euidēt deceits: and to candid and orthodox be-
leeuers, to ēter into the scrutenie of such crooked,
vncertaine and vncoth *ways*. But follow you we
must, whether we will or no, though it be ouer
both shoes and bootes to behould your fondnes;
Lets along *Sir Humfrey*, into your *vis Tusa*, to
see at last whither you will leade vs, to finde forth,
Where was your Church before *Luther*?

Sir Humfrey pag. 71.

In the meane time I will call the Church of
Rome for a witnesse to our cause, and if shee do
not plainly confesse the Antiquity of our Tenents,
and the noueltie of her owne; if she her selfe doe
not proclaime the vniuersallitie of our faith; if she
do not confesse, that we are both in the more cer-
taine and safer way in the Protestant Church, I wil
nether refuse the name, nor the punishment, due
to heresie.

X

A N.

ANSWER.

1. To call vs for witnesses of your cause, and to testifie your Tenents, you haue smale reason, considering the litle steede we haue stood you in, in the former Section. If we had you in the Inquisition, there were some likely-hood to belecue you, but being at libertie where you are, I cannot tell how we may trust you. Where you are, you may presume to say what you list, and how soeuer you offend, to impose vpon your selfe as gentle penance as you please. You may promise much, and performe nothing, as you haue done hitherto. Howsoeuer, because you appeale vnto vs, we canot but heare you. Proceed a Gods name to your prooffe.

Sir Humfrey pag. 72.

He therfore that shall question vs, where our church was before *Luther*, let him looke back into the primitiue Church; nay, let him but looke into the bosome of the present Roman Church, and there he shall finde and confesse, that if euer Antiquitie and Vniuersallitie were markes of the true Church, of right and necessitie, they must belong to ours.

ANSWER.

1. A long leap, without a staffe. He had needed to haue a *prospectiue glasse*, that carries the sight of the looker to an obiekt a far off, that must peepe from *Luther* to the Primitiue Church, fiftene hundred

hundred yeares afunder. The Lapwing still dilco-
 uers her nest, by her owne skrikinge. Your owne
 words bewray your selfe. It is a tacit consent, you
 cannot doe it. If you had any Protestant profes-
 sors, betwixt *Luther* and Primitive Church, what
 neede you bid vs looke back so far, vnlesse to make
 our necks ake, and yet in the end to finde nothing
 for all our looking, and our tooting? The Cha-
 llenge was (as hath bene tould you twenty times)
 to produce your predecessors, *especially in the ages*
before Luther. You had answered your aduersarie,
 and acquitted your selfe like a doughtie Knight,
 if you had but done this. This you haue not done:
 this nether you, nor any of yours, are able to doe.
 To couer your shame, to hide your nakednes,
 what is therfore next to be done? Forsooth, your
 owne trees being dead and withered, and bearing
 nether blossome, frute, nor leapes (like *Adam* and
Eue, when they were starke naked, and had no-
 thing to couer them) you would faine step into
 our garden, to steale some leaues to shadow that;
 that else all the world cries shame to see. You
 should haue bid vs looke into the bosome of the
 Protestant Church, *especially in the ages before Lu-*
ther, and you bid vs looke into the bosome of the pre-
 sent Roman Church. But I suppose we do: what shall
 we find by looking there? Are Protestants lodged
 in the bosome of the present Roman Church? haue
 they bene harbourlesse, haue they layen without
 doores, haue they had no lodging these thousand
 yeares, but in the bosome of that whore of Babi-

lon, betwixt the breasts of that Romish Harlot? haue you not pronounced her pag. 10. for a professed enimie of the gospell? Testifie you not pag. 44. that her errors are so notorious, that a very child may perceiue them? Aske you not this question pag. 140. How can the faith of Christiāns depend vpon a Church, which is fallen from the faith? Present you vs not pag. 319. the Pope with the neck of an Emperor vnder his feete? A Cardinall riding his horse to the bridle in the blood of Saints? Take you not, pag. 323. God and his Angels to witnesse, that had you ten thousand soules, you would not aduenture one of them into the Roman faith, and the Roman Church? Send you not pag. 324. your Reverend M Whitakers with these summons, to the great Champion of the Roman Church? saying. Suruey heauen it selfe, and all the heauenly hoste, looke well into all the parts and coasts of it whilst you list, you shall not finde there (vpon my word) one Iesuit, or one Papist. For none shall stand in Mount Sion with the Lambe, that haue received the marke of the beast, or belong to Antichrist? And bid you vs now to looke into the bosome of the present Roman Church, there to finde a brood of Protestants?

3. Be astonied, o yee beaueus, Ierem. 2. 12. at these words of Sir Humfrey! Behould yee in the nations, and see; Maruel, and be astonished: because a work is done in your dayes (by an English Knight) which no man will beleue when it shall bee tould! Hab. 1. Will you know where all past, and present Reformed Protestants are, & euer haue bine lodged from

from Luther to Christ? *Looke into the bosome of the* whore of Babylon. *Looke into the bosome of that* Romish harlot. *Into the bosome of the professed* enimie of the gospel; *Into her bosome, whose errors* are so notorious, that a very child may perceiue them. *Into her bosome, which is fallen from* the faith. *Into her bosome, who rides her horse to* the bridle in the blood of Saints. *Into her bosome,* who had *Sir Humfrey* ten thousand soules, hee would not aduenture one of them. *Into her bosome,* who hath receiued the marke of the beast, and belongs to Antechrist. *Into her bosome, who* though she bee a mother of many Children, yet not one of them, but are all gone to Hell, and yet thorough the same (as thorough another *Abrahams bosome*) do all Protestants passe to heauen. O miracle of miracles! O maruell of maruells! O Protestant prodigie! O *depth of the riches of the* Wisdome! *and of the knowledg.* Rom. 11. 33. infused from heaue into the head of *Sir Humfrey!* How *incōprehensible are his iudgements,* & *his Vnsafe Wayes,* vnsearchable! O Protestant faith trulie diuine, or rather participating of the Diuinitie it selfe! For as Christ, God and man, consisteth of two distinct natures, yet hath but one *Suppositum* or *Person* to support them both: euen so no lesse miraculous is this mysterie of Protestants, who had a visible profession in all Ages for 1500. yeares together, and yet neuer a *Suppositum* or *Person* of its owne to support it, but only the *bosome of the* Papists! O shallow Reason, strike thy sayles! O

Silly *Sence* how art thou surmounted! *Sight, Taste, and Touch*, in thee are quite deceived. But by only *faith* thou art beleueed. Come all yee Catholiques and consult together! Come all yee learned colleges, and solue this profound riddle of *Sir Humfreyes* proposing, which I confesse, far surpasseth my poore capacitie! and whilst you looke in to the *bosome* of the present Roman Church, to finde some Protestant Professors before *Luther*, I will looke into her Budget (as *Sir Humfrey* bids me) to view the particulars of her Profession.

Sir Humfrey pag. 72.

Looke into the four Creeds which the Church of Rome professeth, and you shall find three of those Creedes are taught and beleueed in our Church. &c. not created by *Luther*. Looke into the seauen Sacraments which the Church of Rome houldeth, and you shall acknowledg that two of those Sacraments, are professed by vs &c. not broached by *Luther*. Looke into the Canō of our Bible, and you shall obserue that 22. bookes of Canonically Scripture which our Church alloweth &c. are approued at this day by the Church of Rome, not deuiled by *Luther*. Looke into the first 7. generall Councils, and you shall confesse that four of them are ratified by the Canons of our Church, and by act of Parliament, not called by *Luther*. (And so he goes forward with Traditions. With their booke of Common prayer. And the Ordination and calling of their Pastors; and then running them

them ouer the second time, concludeth thus.) If therefore the three Creeds, the two principall Sacraments, the 22 bookes of Canonick scripture, the first four generall Councils, the Apostolique Traditions, the Ancient Lyturgies, the Ordination of Pastors, if, I say, all these were anciently taught, and vniuersally receiued in all ages in the bosome of the Roman Church, euen by the testimonie of our aduersaries them selues: is it not a fillie and senslesse question, to demand of vs, where our Church was before *Luther*?

A N S W E R.

1. It is without dout, *Sir Humfrey*, great pittie, that Papists are such very block-heads, such fillie and senslesse sorts, to propose to Protestants such absurd demands, as haue nether rhyme nor reason. And because this booke was sent to me to conuert me, and to enlighten my blinded eyes, in the way of the Lord, I hope you will giue your poore scholler leaue, to make vse of that which hee hath learned in your owne schoole. I will imagine then that you had to doe with some Turke or Pagan, instead of a Papist, pressing him to proue, where his Church was before *Mahomet*! This Turke (not altogether so peruerse, but much more tractable to many points of Christianitie, then most of his other companions are) argues with *Sir Humfrey* thus, to iustifie his faith and his predecessors profession, against his. *Hee that shall question vs where our Church was before Mahomet, let him looke back*

into the primitive Church ; nay let him but looke into the bosome of the present English Church, and there he shall find and confesse, that if euer Antiquitie and Vniuersallitie, were markes of the true Church, of right & necessity they must belong to ours. Looke into the Three Creeds which the Church of England professeth, and you shall finde two of those Creeds taught in ours, not created by Mahomet. Looke into the two Sacraments, which the Church of England houldeth, and you shall acknowledge, that one of those Two are professed by vs, not broached by Mahomet. Looke into the Canon of our Bible, and you shall obserue, that all the bookes of the old Testament which our Church alloweth (though none of the new) were vniuersally receiued in all ages, and are approued at this day by the Church of England, not denied by Mahomet. Looke into the first four generall Councels, confirmed by the English Acts of Parliament, and you shall find that two of them, are ratified by our Church, not so called by Mahomet. Lastly, looke into that mayne fundamentall point of all the rest, the three persons of the B. Trinitie, acknowledged by the Church of England, and you shall find that we acknowledg two of them as well as shee. If therefore the two Creedes, one of the two principall Sacraments, of the Church, all the Canonickall bookes of the old Testament, two of the four generall Councells, two of the persons of the B. Trinitie, if I say, all these were anciently taught and vniuersally receiued in all ages in the Bosome of the English

glish Church, euen by the testimonies of our aduersaries them selues: is it not a fillie and senselesse question, to demand of vs, where our Church was before Mahomet? This, Sir Humfrey, is your owne deepe Logique, and therefore you will not I hope, disallow it. Now goe forward on Gods name, with the rest: my Turke will track you word for word, & easily retort the rest vpon your selfe.

Sir Humfrey pag. 76.

The positiue Doctrine which we (*Turkes*) teach, is contayned in a few principall points and those also haue Antiquitie and vniuersallitie, with the consent of the Roman Church (*of the English, saith my Turke.*) The points in controuersie, which are *sub Iudice*, and in question, are for the most part (if not all) additions obtruded vpon the Church, and certainly from those additions, and new Articles of faith, the question doth truly and properly result vpon them selues. Where was your Church (that is) where was your Trent Doctrine, and Articles of the Roman Creed (*my Turke sayes, your English doctrine and 39. Articles of you English Creed*) receiued de Fide, before Luther? If therefore our (*Turkish*) doctrine lay inuolued in the bosome of the (*English, you say*) Roman Church, which no Romanist can deny; If I say it became hidden, as good corne couered with chaffe, or as fine gold ouer-laid with a greater quantitie of drosse, was it therefore new and vnknownen,

vnknownen, because Poperie (*Protestancie*) sought by a preuayling faction to obicure it? Was there no good corne in the Granarie of the Church, because, for manie yeares space, till Luthers (*Mahometts*) dayes, it was not seuered from the chaffe? No pure gold, because our aduersaries would not refyne it by the fire of Gods word? If the chaffe and drosse be ours, or if our Church, sauer of nothing but Noueltie and heresie (as some of those men pretend) let them remoue from the bosome of their owne Church, that new and hereticall doctrine, which they say was neuer heard of before Luther, and tell me, if their Church wil not proue, a poore and senslesse carkasse, and a dead body without a soule? Take away the three Creeds which we professe: our two Sacraments &c.

A N S W E R.

1. To all this (besides that euery Turk is able to retort it) I say, I will admit that these positieue points of your Protestant doctrine, *lay inuolued in the bosome of the Roman Church*, so that you also admit, that the points lay there without any persons at all to professe them: grant but this and we are agreed, but make not the points to be yours, and we the professors of your points, for that we neuer will agree vnto, vnlesse you can proue vnto vs, as I said before, that it is a *suppositum* without a person, or a substance without a subiect of its owne to sublist in. But where you say. *If it became hidden as good corne couered with chaffe, or as*
fine

fine gold ouer-laid with a greater quantitie of drosse, was it therefore new and vnknown, because Poperie sought by a preuayling faction to obscure it? This I confesse, seemes to me maruelous strang and obscure. For my better vnderstanding therefore, tell me Sir Humfrey (my learned Tutor) who hid and couered this good corne with our chaffe? who ouer-laid this fine gold with a greater quantitie of our drosse, & that in the bosome of our Roman Church? Was it God? Or was it your selues? Admit it were, ether he, or you, how haps that nether of you could find a better nor securer place to lay vp such a treasure in, then in the handes of the Romish Harlot, in the very Bosome of the Whore of Babilon, and who rides her horse to the bridle in the blood of Saints? See you not how you accule (not your selues alone of lack of wit) but ouen the wisdome of the highest? What may Pagans say, to heare Chritians censure thus of their owne God? Againe, if this good corne were couered by vs? If this fine gold were ouer laid by vs? If the Bosome of the Romish Church, haue serued for a harbour this 1000. or this 1500. yeares to lodge those, and to keepe life in thole of your profession, how hangs it together, that she sought by a preuayling faction to obscure them? How did she not wholly stifle & extinguish them (as she might haue done) when she had them there? Is the bosome of a mother? Are hir breastes (which are the two places that principally giue warmth and life) places worthy to be censured of such inhumanitie, as to stifle

stifele or obscure that, which for so many hundred yeares it had saued alieue? What more contrary to all sence and reason? What more absurd or contradictory in it selfe then such a conception?

2. Briefly, because you make this demand; *Was there no good corne in the Granary of the Church, because for many yeares space, till Luthers dayes, it was not seuered from the Chasse? No pure gold &c.* This very demand, I say, doth vtterly vndoe you; this very confession doth vtterly confound you; for this is as much as to tell vs in plaine tearmes, that your Church was hid for many yeares space before *Luther*; and that in very deed before the dayes of *Luther*, you had nether *corne* nor *chasse*, nor *gold* nor *drosse*, nor no being at all out of our *bosome*, where yet neuer any of that brood rested for an houre. But admit they did; when they were thus in our *Bosome*, in our *Granarie*, and couered in our *Chasse* and *Drosse*, ether they were in the true Church, or they were out. If they were within: then being within our *bosome*, we also were within. If they were without, then were they Heretiques. And thus are you *Sir Humfrey*, euery way confuted, and your *via Tuta* shewed to be a meere *enigma* and *chymera*, hauing no other being, then in your owne braine. Your toyish inuention, found to be a shoe which may fit the foote of euery Turke. And will your Gullies swallow such gob-bets? Blessed Lord, with what eyes do Protestants read such sillie pamphlets? With what eares doe they harken to such sorrie reasons? With what harts

harts do they examine such triuiall stuffe? Verely,
 eyes they haue and see not: eares they haue and heare
 not; their foolish hart is blinded, saith our Saniour.

Sir Humfrey pag. 79.

It is true that we deny their additions (to wit,
 their *aliquid amplius*) because they are grounded
 on humane authoritie (33. *vntrush*) and want the
 foundation of the scriptures. We deny Purgatory,
 Inuocation of Saints, workes of Supererogation,
 worship of Images, and the like. And if our Re-
 ligion be therefore tearmed Negative for deniall
 of those thinges, who sees not, but for the like
 reason they them selues stand guiltie of the same
 aspersiō? Do not they deny the substance of bread
 after Consecration? Do not they deny the scrip-
 tures to containe thinges necessarye to saluation
 (34. *vntrush*) Doe they not deny the reading of
 them to Christian people? Do they not deny Ma-
 riage to the Priests? the Cup to the lay people?
 the Supremacie to their Soueraigne in his owne
 Dominions? And may not we for these and the
 like reasons protest against them, that therefore
 theirs is a Negative Religion?

A N S W E R.

No Sir, you may not; the reason is, because
 these are not Negative in them selues, but only
 so *ex consequenti*; For it is the positieue doctrine of
 the Church, that the bread being first there, is af-
 terwards cōuerted into the body of Christ: which
 presupposed it followeth by due consequent that
 it

it cannot be there: becaule it implyeth, to be both there, and to be conuerted into flesh. We deny not the Scriptures to containe things necessary to saluation, but to containe things necessary to saluation euidently, so as to be able by them alone to enforce a refractarie man to yeeld to truth. Nay which is yet more, we grant them to cōtaine euen those things also, *virtually* and *implicitly*. We deny not the reading of them to Christian people, vnlesse to such as are iudged vncapable; if we did, how should I now reade them, and discouer here how you haue corrupted them? We deny not Marriage to any, but only to him who first hath bound him selfe by vow not to marrie: and so we principally deny him, not to breake his vow. We deny not the blood of Christ to the lay people, becaule we teache the same to be vnder the species of the bread. We deny not the Supremacy absolutely, because we hould the Pope to be the Supream head of all Churches vnder Christ: all which are nether grounded on humane authoritie only, nor want the foundation of the Scriptures, as you fancie.

2. Contrary wise, you deny not Purgatorie in one respect, and grant it in another. You deny not Inuocation of Saints in one respect, and grant it in another, You deny not works of Supererogation in one respect, and grant them in another. You deny not the worship of Images in one respect, or *ex consequenti*, and allow it another: but you deny then absolutely, and therefore absolutely yours is
a Nega-

a Negative Religion, and not so ours. These of yours are grounded indeed on humane authoritie, and want the foundation of the Scriptures, and therefore absolutely is of humane authority. And for denying supremacie to each soueraigne in his owne Dominions, I wonder you shame not to instance that; For do the Reformed Churches of France, of the Low Contries, and of other places, graunt the Supremacie in all ecclesiasticall causes to their temporall soueraigne in his owne Dominions, yea, or no? If yea, then of the same Religion their supream head is, all they his members ought to be. Then all the heretiques vnder the King of Spaine and the King of France, ought to be Papists. If no, then how is not this only grounded vpon humane authoritie, and wants the foundation of the Scriptures? Will you neuer beware of the Wolfe?

After *Sir Humfrey* hath laboured a litle to excuse their Religion from the name of *Negative*, and to retort (as well as he is able) the tearme on vs, he thus shuts vp this 8. Section, scarce vsing one true word in all that followes.

Sir Humfrey pap. 80. &c.

But that the world may know we retort not these things by way of recrimination, it shall appeare by their owne confession, that the Traditions which we deny, are declined by the best learned amongst them selues (33. *vntrusth.*) Nay more, they doe not only acknowledge those thinges, which

which we hould (36. *vnttruth.*) But the most ingenious of them, are ashamed also of those additions of theirs which we deny. (37. *vnttruth.*) As for instance we charge them with the worship of Images: they deny it, or at least excuse their manner of Adoration, but they condemne not vs for not worshiping (38. *vnttruth.*) We accuse them for praying in an vnknownen tongue; they excuse it, that God knowes the meaning of the hart: but they doe not condemne vs for praying with the spirit. (*No more do you vs, euen praying in an vnknownen tongue: but we condemne you for breaking of the Churches order.*) We condemne them for adoring the elements of bread and wine in the Sacrament, because it depēds vpon the intention of the priest: they excuse it, that they adore vpon condition, *If the consecrated bread be Christ*; but they do not condemne vs for adoring Christs reall body in heauen (*false when it is ioyned with contempt or deniall of that in earth, and therefore is the 39. vnttruth.*) We accuse them for taking away the Cup from the lay people: they excuse it, that it *was not taken vp by the commandment of the Bishops, but is crept in, the Bishops drinking thereat* (saith Costerus) but they do not condemne vs for following Christs example, and receiuing in both kinkes (*false, because it is ioyned with contempt of the Churches authoritie, which Christ hath willed all to heare, and is therefore the 40. vnttruth.* Mat. 23. 1. Lastly we accuse them for their priuat Masses, contrarie to Christs institution (41. *vnttruth.*) And the custome of the pri-
mitiue

minie Church (40. *vntrust*.) they excuse it (41. *vntrust*) that it is thorough their owne default and negligence, wherof (saith M. Harding) the godly and faithfull people, since the time of the Primitive Church, haue much complained (false and falsifying your very Author) and therefore is the (42. *vntrust*.) And which is remarkable and comfortable to all beleeuing Protestants, we charge them with flat Idolatrie in the adoration of the Sacrament, of Reliques, of Saints, of Images. And howsoeuer they excuse them selues, in distinguishing their maner of Adoration, yet I say, to our endlesse comfort be it spoken, they cannot charge vs in the Positiue doctrine of our Church, no, not with the least suspicion of Idolatrie. False, and is the (43. *vntrust*.) for you adore your Sacrament, as well as we ours. You adore the elements of bread and wine, as well as we. False also, for that we teach no bread to be there. And how then adore we that which is not there?

A N S W E R.

1. You promised to proue the whole by the best learned and most ingenious amongst our selues: the points are six: your witnesses but foure. But two or three of them ours, and they falsified; Now, is not this remarkable and comfortable to all beleeuing Protestants? Will it not turne to their endlesse comforts, to see so many *vntrusts* laid open in so few lines? For shame, Sir Humfrey amend this fault. Remember the councell of the Apostle; Let euery one of you speake truth to his brother. You

are challenged, to shew a Catalogue of visible Protestant professors in all ages, especially in those before Luther. You haue vndertaken to performe this. You confesse it for an vndouted truth, that such visible professors were in all ages. That you will make good this visibility of Protestant professors, from the testimonie of your sworne enemies. In all this Section, you recite the names but only of foure, to wit, of Pope Pius the 4. Pope Adrian the 6. Costerus, and D. Harding. Were these, I pray you, all Protestants? Or if they were, what are these foure to fill a Catalogue of fourteene of fifteene hundred yeares? What is this to vindicat your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation? What is this to shew, that it is no difficult thing for a meane Lay-man in your Religion, to answer this demand, *Where was your Church before Luther?* Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, vnlesse you meane to make all the world to laugh at you and your Essay: vnlesse you meane to make the world laugh at you, and your Safe Way. Your Catalogue, Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, Sith your selfe tell vs, It is an vndouted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible professors in all ages. Sith Truth it selfe doth assure vs. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11.

Sec.

Section I X.

THe Testimonies of our Adversaries touching the Protestant, and Roman faith, in the particulars.

A N S W E R.

1. This one Section consisteth of Nine distinct and severall Paragraphes, and is almost as bigge as all the booke besides. The Nine particular points here handled by *Sir Humfrey*, are these that followe. 1. Iustification by faith, only. 2. The Sacrament of Baptisme, and the Lords Supper. 3. Transubstantiation. 4. Priuat Masse. 5. The seven Sacraments. 6. Communion in both kinds. 7. Prayer and service in an vnknownen tongue. 8. Worship of Images. 9. Indulgences: not one of which, but haue bene spoken of before, I know not how oft, and all to no purpose. 1. For that it is not the thing that is exacted of *Sir Humfrey*, nor satisfies not the Iesuits Challenge. 2. It comes short of his promise and vndertaking, we hauing told him almost twentie times ouer, that it is not their Faith, but their Faithfull: not their Profession, but their Professors: not the particular points of the one, or the other, but a List, a Rolle, a Catalogue of the Names and particular Persons of such Protestants as liued in all Ages from Christ to Luther. This cannot be want of wit in *Sir Humfrey*

to vnderstand what we demand, but want of ability, or rather plaine impossibilitie on his part, to performe his promise: and therefore the better to hoodwinke, to blindfould, to deceiue, and carry away his inconsiderat and vnskilfull Reader, he trifles out the time, and pussels his vnderstanding with a tedious discourse about some particular points in controuersie betwixt vs and them, craftily changing the state of the question, craftily a-voiding the maine controuersie: and this is all the sorie shift *Sir Humfrey* hath to slide away: which euery childe, or any other that is not wilfullie blinde, may plainly perceiue.

2. To auoide the losse of further Time, or Trouble in answering the Nine particulars of this Section, besides what hath already bene said by my selfe, I might remit *Sir Humfrey*, for his further satisfaction to the Authors ensuing, who haue in our owne language, particularly, and most learnedly refuted whatsoeuer Protestants haue bene able to say about thele Nine points. Namely, for Iustification by only faith, to that learned Treatise of my Lord Bishop of Calcedon, intituled, *M. Perkins Reformed Catholique &c.* For the Sacrament of Baptisme, to a Treatise intituled; *The life and gate of Christianitie*. For the Lords Supper, to a most excellent Treatise written by M. Doctor Sanders, intituled; *The Supper of our Lord*. For Transubstantiation, to the same Author, as also to Cardinall Allens most learned Treatise, intituled. *The Parliament of Christ*. And to the Plea for the Real
pre-

presence against *Sir Humfrey*. For Priuat Masse, to a Treatise written by M. Doctor *Harding*, intituled; *An Answer to M. Iewels Challenge*. For the Sacraments, to a Treatise written by Doctor *Watson* Bishop of Lincolne. *Bellarmins Catechisme*. *Canisius Summe of Christian doctrine*. For Communion in both kindes, to Doctor *Hardings Detection*, and his Reioinder to M. *Iewell*. For Prayer, and Service in an vnknownen tongue, to Doctor *Stapletons Returne of vntruths* against M. *Iewel*, art. 3. and to the *Answer to the Nine points* proposed by our Soueraigne K. *Iames*. For worship of Images, to A Treatise of Images written by D. *Sanders*: For Indulgences, to a Treatise written by Cardinall *Allen*, of that very subiect, intituled; *Of the Popes Pardons*. As also to another lately printed, intituled; *A Treatise of Indulgences*, besides to a number more which I omit for breuitie sake. Notwithstanding knowing full well how hard it is to content wranglers, and to giue more ample satisfaction then in rigor we need, I will performe two seuerall thinges; The one to collect and lay together the names of those Authors, which *Sir Humfrey* hath cited in this Section, to see whether they be Papists or Protestants (our seeking being still for Persons, not for Profession, how true, or false soeuer it be.) And yet besides, say somewhat to eache point and authoritie in particular.

Parag. I.

Iustificatio by faith (only.)

Sir Humfrey. pag. 84.

THese things premised, I will proceed to the examination of witnesses. both for the Antiquity of our Doctrine, and the Nouelty of theirs: But before I goe to publication, I will present you with two Records, for two principall points of our faith. By which evidences it shall appeare, that the Word and Sacraments, the proper marks of a true Church, were rightly preached, and duly administred here in England, in the most obscure ages, long before *Luthers* dayes. I say, it shall appeare, that before and after the Conquest, the Priests and Professors of those times, protested openly against the doctrine of Romish merits, preaching saluation thorough Christ alone; and withall publicquely professed and administred the same Sacraments, in the same faith and truth which we teache and administer at this day (44. *vntruth.*)

A N S W E R.

1. Marke, *Sir Humfrey*, your vndertaking, you will make it appeare, that both before and after the Conquest, the Word and Sacraments were rightly preached, and duly administred here in England

gland in the most obscure Ages. You will make it further appeare, that the Priests and Professors of those times, publicly professed and administred the same Sacraments, in the same faith and truth, which you teache and administer at this day. This is that which we so long haue looked for. This, to say the truth (if you performe) is conforme to your first vndertaking, Section 1. pag. 5. wherein you oblige your selfe to shew, that the English Sister, hath kept *her first loue, and continued her ancient birth-right, from the time of the Apostles, to the dayes of Luther. Fac hoc, & viues.* Do this, and you shall liue for euer in the loue and memory of your English Mother; She longeth, she languisheth after this morcell of venison; If you haue hunted so wel that you haue caught her this dainty disse, doubtlesse she will giue you (though her youngest sonne) her benediction from all your other elder Reformed bretheren.

2. But is it possible; yea, or but probable, that when all the Priests of England said Masse and Marins, only in the Latin, not in the English tongue? Built Churches to seuerall Saints? Religiouslie reserued their Reliques? Erected Monasteries for men & women? Practised seauen Sacraments? Prayed for the soules departed? Acknowledged the Pope for head of the whole Church? Confest their actuall sinnes in the eare of the Priett? Fulfilled the penance enioyned for them? Every where set up Images, as we doe now (which theould glasse windoes, and other monuments doe euen

to this day witnesse evidently to all the world) Is it possible, I say, or but probable, that the Word and Sacraments, were then rightly preached, and duly administred here in England in the most obscure ages, in the selfe same faith and truth, which Protestants teach and administer them at this day? Who but *Sir Humfrey*, would euer dare to say this? Againe, if the Word and Sacraments were rightly preached, and duly administred, in the selfe same faith and truth which Protestants deliuer them in at this day, how call you them, *most obscure ages*? Tell vs, we pray you, the plaine meaning of this riddle? But to the performance of your promise, and production of your *two Records*.

Sir Humfrey pag. 85.

In the dayes of *Anselme* Archbishop of Canterburie, about the yeare 1080. there was a set and publique forme of prayer prescribed for the visitation of the sick; and this forme (saith *Cassander*) in *Bibliothecis passim obuia*, was commonly to be had in libraries: the wordes are plaine, and fully consonant to the faith that our Church professeth. *Dost thou beleue to come to glorie, not by thine owne merits, but by the vertu and merit of the passion of our Lord Iesus-Christ? Dost thou beleue, that our Lord Iesus-Christ did die for our saluation, and that none can be saued by his owne merits, or by any other meanes, but by the merit of his passion? &c.* and the sick parson was taught to make answer accordingly.

A N S W E R.

Marke, *Sir Humfrey*, the performance of your prodigall and ample promise, which was to make it appeare 1. that the Word and Sacraments, were rightly preached and duly administred here in England before and after the Conquest in the same faith and truth, as they are with you at this very day. 2. You tell vs, of two Records, one of *G. Cassander*, another of *Hosius*. 3. That this was in the dayes of *S. Anselme* both before, and after the Conquest? 4. your Authors are, *Hosius* and *Cassander*: who lived since *Luther*, your friend, our enemie, and a ranck Heretique. Is this an vpright iudge in the cause of the accused? The point is but one, to wit, of *Iustification* by faith only: and how makes this appeare, that the Word and Sacraments, were preached and duly administred here in England, before and after the Conquest, in the same faith and truth which your Church teacheth at this day? Is the whole Word of God, and the Sacraments, reduced only to one Article? Or is your doctrine of *Iustification*, become a Sacrament? Where are then your other 38. You say the Priests and professors of those times, protelted openly against our Romish doctrine in this point, and name not one Priest, nor one professor in particular to confirme what you say. Lord how seeke you to deceiue! Lord, how endeouour you to delude, and yet performe the same so palpable!

Sir Humfrey pag. 88. 89.

This point of faith, was publickely professed in the Church of England, and generally practised shortly after the Conquest, both by Priests and people. But obserue the cunning of our aduersary. That booke which was published in *Anselmes* dayes, for instruction and visitation of the sick, I say, the same booke, both for matter and substance, hath of late yeares bene printed at *Paris*, *Collen*, at *Venice*: wherby not only the doctrine of Merits is eclipsed, but now the Roman faith is discovered to differ from the ancient. What meanes therefore can we imagine may be found, how these men should rectifie their owne printed Authors? Behould, the Roman Inquisitors, haue carefully provided by two Expurgatory Indices, that the words of comfort which the Priest was enioyned to pronounce to the sick person, should be blotted out.

A N S W E R.

I. It is no smale crime, *Sir Humfrey*, to accuse the whole English church, both Priests & people, of that fact, wherin you will be neuer able to finde the one halfe, nor yet the hundred part guilty. Let vs therefore examine this graue and weighty accusation, brought against both her, & the Church of Rome. *Sir Humfrey* with *Cassander* (a young start-up of yesterdayes standing) affirmes, that this point of faith (of *Iustification*) was publickely and generally professed here in England, after the Conquest,

quest, both by Priests and people; Ergo the doctrine of Merits is now eclipsed. These two finde this one point, printed and published in one only contry. Ergo the now Roman faith doth differ from the ancient in all Christian contries in the world. The Roman Inquisitors by Expurgatory Indices, haue carefully provided to blot thole words of comfort out of that one booke. Ergo for this one fact, the whole Church hath altered her faith. Now that *Sir Humfrey* is come to examinatio of witnesses, now that he hath presented vs with two Records, with such cleare and manifest evidences against the whole Church of that age, doth it not plainly appeare vnto you to be as he laid? Doth it not plainly appeare, that both before and after the Conquest, the Word and Sacraments were administred here in England in the same faith and truth that they are by Protestants at this present? Is not *Sir Humfreys* testimony, confirmed with *Cassanders*, enough to ouerturne the credit of the whole Church? And although it were so many hundred yeares agoe; so publicquely practised both by Priests and people; though in all thole hundred yeares, no priests, nor people, ether by word or writing, tooke notice of the Author, the Time, the Place, the Beginning, Increasing, and the Resistance made at the first arising, till *Cassander* and *Sir Humfrey* first tooke notice, and first cryed out against her for this novelty, is not their bare word, is not their simple assertion, enough, yea and more then enough to proue

proue the Antiquitie of their doctrine, and the nouelty of ours? to make the matter most clearly appeare to all the world? What I pray is to make a thing of such importance, appeare most clearly vnto vs; if this be not? *Lord haue mercy vpon vs, Christ haue mercy vpon vs, Lord haue mercy vpon vs,* to see with what sillie eyes vnlearned Protestants read such sillie booke set forth by their learned, and to see with what sillie shifts, learned Protestants endeouour to deceiue their ignorant, vnlearned, and vnskilfull Readers!

2. But here I maruell much at one matter, that whereas on the one side, *Sir Humfrey* stiles and dignifies this, with *one of the principall points* of the Protestant Faith, and on the other, prouokes to sole Scripture for all he professeth, how it comes to passe that this so principall point, and the first of all the nine peeces of Artillerie, which he hath planted in this batterie, is not backt and fortified with holy Scripture? I gaue a brief touch before pag. 102. against *M. Preston*, about the want of this one hearb, which spoileth all their English pottage, I can not let *Sir Humfrey* escape without a litle scuffling with him about this so principall a point of Protestantisme, and that at the selfe same weapons wherto he prouoketh: marke the cariage and issue, of this Encounter.

3. *Sir Humfreys* assertion is of, *Iustification by faith only*; Scripture he cites none at all, but, *ipse dixit*; himselfe layes it. The contrary of this assertion, I proue out of Scripture thus, *Iames 2. 24.*

Do you see that by works a man is iustified, and not by faith only? This Assertion is directly contradictory, to that principall point of Sir Humfres faith, and of all Protestants, the Apostle assuring, that man is iustified by good workes, and not by faith only: but both he, and they, that man is not iustified by good workes, but by faith only. For albeit some scripture saith, that man is iustified by faith, yet it neuer saith, by faith only, in exclusion of workes. Hath not Sir Humfrey now iust cause to cry out and say (pag. 38.) When our Religion is directly and immediatly deriued from the scripture; When our Doctrine agreeth in the fundamentall points with S. Austen and the Fathers; When the primitive and Reformed Churches haue shaken handes together, is it not a meere malice, to oppose a known ancient Doctrine, and to make a league against God and his Word? Against the true Religion and her Church? &c. yet it cannot be denied, that this is the comon practise of the Romish (he should haue said of the English) Church. For otherwise, what man in his right senses, would take vpō him to be wiser then God Et pag. 44. If men, for advantage of their cause, and for their owne preferment, will by shifts and cauils, turne the necks of Scriptures and Fathers cleane about, and wrest them to their owne side, let them beware of their example who could not beleue, or if they did beleue, durst not confesse Christ, because they sought the praise of men, more then the praise of God? Iohn. 5. 44.

4. To conclude this part of the 9. Section and 1. Paragraph, handling so principall a point of
your

your Protestant profession, you haue brought in prooffe therof, only two Testimonies, one of *Cassander*, another of *Hosius*, for all the Ages, both before and after the Conquest (both of them aliue since *Luther* dyed) which according to promise and vndertaking, ought to haue containyd Testimonies in all Ages from Christ to vs, and thole to haue beene deduced orderly, and in *directa linea*. Againe, one of them is an Heretique, and condemned by the Catholique Church, where you promised to conuince vs out of the Testimonies of approued Cardinals, Bishops, Doctors and Scholemen allowed by vs. How defectiue then are you found in prooffe of this point? Remember I pray (*Sir Humfrey*) hereafter, your owne Name, and that alone will put you in minde what your proofes ought to be, to wit, in a straight and direct *Lyne*, else they are nether *Lyne*, nor Bombasted as they ought to be, but are so many false, and deceitfull stiches, not houlding nor ioyning the patched peeces of your Reformed garment well together. Which considered, I cannot but call vpon you as before, your Catalogue *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, that *Buttery booke*, as some of yours (scarce Christianly) haue vouchsafed to call it. (Defence of Appen. pag. 14.) Dally with vs no longer about your Doct.ine, fidle no longer about your faith; especially sith your selfe confesse; *It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible professor*

in all Ages; Especially fith holy Scripture assureth vs (wherto you solely appeale.) And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints; vnto the worke of the Ministry, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11.

Parag. II.

*Of the Sacrament of Baptisme, and the
Lords Supper.*

Sir Humfrey pag. 90. 91.

First, concerning the Sacrament of Baptisme, I thinke there is none so blind or stupid, that will deny the Baptisme now vsed in our Church, both for matter and forme, to be substantially the same that the primitiue Church euer vsed &c. And as concerning the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, in the dayes of *Ælfrick*, about the yeare 996. there was a homilie appointed publicly to be read to the people on Easter day before they did receiue the Communion: wherein the same faith and doctrine (which our Church now professeth) was publicly taught and receiued (45. *vntrush*,) and the Doctrine of the Reall presence (which at that time had got some footing in the Church) was plainly confuted and reiected. And then a litle
after

after you cite the wordes of *Elfricke* related by *M. Doctor Vsher*, saying. There is a great difference betwixt the body wherein Christ suffered, and the body which is receiued of the faithfull, The body truly that Christ suffered in, it was borne of the flesh of Marie, with blood, and with bone, with skinne and with sinewes in humane limmes, with a reasonable soule liuing : and his spirituall body, which nourisheth the faithful spiritually, is gathered of many cornes, without blood & bone, without limme, without soule, & therfore there is nothing to be vnderstood bodily, but spiritually &c.

A N S W E R.

1. Lord *Sir Humfrey*, when will you deale sincerely? When will you cease to seeke to deceiue the soules of the simple, redeemed with the blood of our Saviour *Iesus*? Shall I shew you, how many wayes you halt? how many wayes this prooue of yours doth proue defectiue? 1. Then as I haue often tould you. (and now with grieve tell you againe) you directly fly the state of the question; you come not nere; you satisfie not the Iesuits Challenge, by enumerating the names of your visible Protestant professors, especially in the Ages before *Luther*: the principall thing vrged against you; the principall thing you vndertookey; and the principall thing you are to performe, vnlesse you thinke it enough to promile much, and to performe iust nothing.

2. I lay secondly; Admit instead of enumeration

of

of Persons and Names, that it might suffice to proue the points of Doctrine in dispute betwixt vs, yet (and I pray the Reader to marke this point of aduise particularly) granting so freely as you doe, *that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages* (Epist. Ded. pag. 3.) Granting further in the same Epist. pag. 9. that we call for a Catalogue of names of such Protestants, as taught and professed in all Ages, the 39. Articles of your Religion; nay, boasting further in sundry places of your booke, of the *vniversallitie of your faith*, which you will force the Church of Rome her selfe to proclaime in your behalfe (pag. 71.) according, I say to this confession, you are bound, you are compelled, you cannot doe lesse, then at least to produce for euery seuerall point, one particular and seuerall testimonie in each particular and seuerall Age; a perspicuous, plaine, and euident modell whereof, is laid before you in the *Summarie of Controuersies*, pag. 147. Where this particular Controuersie of the *Reall presence*, is deduced from age to age, from Christ to vs, by as many particular testimonies, as there are Ages.

3. I say *thirdly*, this *Sir Humfrey* is the thing you are to doe, and not to come in halting with one only testimony; with one only authority; written after a thousand yeares; by one only man, of one only contry, and without the consent of other nations; For how veresieth this your English faith (euen in this point alone) to haue bene the faith of all Ages? of all nations? and to be the *vniversall faith*?

faith? Surely this is to seeke to deceiue, but after a grosse and iensible sort, so that, to vse your owne wordes, *a very childe may discouer* the same. And what you were to do for prooffe of this one point, you ought to haue done of all the rest, if you will proceed really and candidly. Which, because you fly to name your Protestant *professors*, and recurre to their *profession*; because you start from the *Doctors* to their *Doctrine*, and from the *persons* of the *faithfull*, to the points of their *faith*, I straightly presse, and charge my Protestant Reader, to looke vnto your false play, and to exact at your handes, the particular performance of this point: so shall he be luse to discouer your deceit, and finde you as vnable to performe this, as that other demand, which breakes the very hartes of you all. *Where was your Church before Luther?*

4. I say fourthly; Where you affirme that the same *faith* and doctrine, which your Church now professeth, was publicquely receiued, and the doctrine of the Reall presence, which at that time had got some footing in the Church, plainly confuted and reiected; Who I pray, were the parties that disputed the point? What were their names? What the propositions? Where the place where the points were disputed? Who the Iudges? What the words of the sentence, in comendation of your *faith*, and in condemnation of ours? All these particulars you are to put downe, if you will proceede sincerely, and not endeauour to deceiue most palpably; For, as I haue told you often before; *If it suffice to accuse, who can possibly*

possibly escape Scot-free?

5. I say *fiftly*; Touching this *Ælfricke*, whom you make the Author of this *Homelie*, answerable to the faith and doctrine which your Church professeth at this present, I have proved before, against *M. Preston* pag. 108. and that from the confession of learned Protestants, that he is there censured by them for a craftie Papist, and for his craft in promoting Papistrie, made Archbishop of Canterburie: you make him, and all the Cleargie of England vnder him, to be all Protestants; contrariewise *M. Bale* accounteth him for a craftie Papist, and a speciall promoter therof: how agrees, how accords, how hanges these two so contrarie tales, handsomlie together? Can you, with all your cuning reconcile them? Touching the *homelie*, you attribut to him, *Iohn Foxe* himselfe, a great searcher of Antiquities, pag. 1040. edit 1596. is doubtfull whether it be his or no: and the Protestants that published the same, deny it in their preface before the booke, as the learned Author of the *Prudentiall Ballance*, hath well obserued vpon the life of this Bishop, the 26. after *S. Austen*.

6. I say *sixtly*; Touching the doctrine it selfe containd in the said homelie, admit it were his, I for my part, see not but it may be easilie reconciled, with the present faith of the Church of Rome; For who doubts, but that there is a great difference, betwixt the body wherein Christ suffered, and the body which is receiued of the faithfull? That was borne of the flesh of Marie: this cauled to be,

by the power of the Sacramentall wordes . That was clothed with visible flesh, blood, bone, skinne, sinnewes in humane limmes . This hath no such thinge visiblie . That was offered vpon the Crosse after a cruentall , this after an incruentall maner, yet euer one & the selfe same body. Which the very words themselues (in my shallow iudgment) euen of M. Doctor Vsher , doe clearly witness; For in his *Answer to the Iesuits Challenge*, pag. 77. 78. 79. 80. from whence you tooke them, thus he saith in expresse tearmes, all which you most craftely haue concealed.

7. The bread and the Wine , Which by the priests ministrie is halloWed, shew one thing without to mens senses, and another thing they call within to beleeuing mindes. Without, they be seene bread and Wine , both in figure, and in taste: and they be trulie , after their halloWing, Christs body and his blood by spirituall mysterie &c. If we behould that holie housel after bodely sense, then see we that it is a creature, corruptible and mutable. If we acknowledge therein spiritual vertu, then vnderstand we that life is therein , and that it giueth immortality to them that eate it with beleefe &c. And a litle after he cōcludeth thus. Christ halloWed bread and Wine to housell before his suffering, and said. This is my body, and my blood , yet he had not then suffered: but so notwithstanding he turned thorough inuisible vertu , the bread to his owne body , and that Wine to his blood &c.

8. Marke , for Gods sake , what a number of euident disparities there are in this homelie of
Alstricks

Ælfricks differing from your present Protestant profession. There the creatures are *hallowed*; are, they so in yours? Without they be seene bread and wine, both in figure and taste: after hallowing, they become *Christs body and blood*: doe they so in yours? There, according to bodely sense, it is discerned for a creature, but if we respect their spirituall virtu, *life is therein*: is there so in yours? There, Christ *turned* thorough inuisible vertue, the bread *into his bodie*, and the wine *into his blood*, is there any such *turning*, any such alteration, any such change or transmutation made in yours? If not, how false is it, that this Sacrament was *dulie administred in the same faith and doctrine before the Conquest*, as it is now declared and receiued in the Church of England? If therefore after hallowing, contrary to sense, it become *the body and blood of Christ*: if *life be therein*: if the bread be *turned* into the body, and the wine into the blood of Christ, all the differences which you finde, must ether be vnderstood of the externall *Species* (which sometimes ate called by the name of that which lies diuinely couered and vailed vnder them) or else you must make this *Ælfricke*, quite contrarie to himselfe. And to say the truth, your owne selfe discredit the same authoritie, which yet you seeme to bringe to make so much for your forlorne cause: for pag. 97. thus you say.

Sir Humfrey pag. 97.

And although the Inquisitors, had not as yet
 Z 3 passed

passed their sentence vpon this *Ælfrickes* homily, yet in that homilie they haue suggested *Transubstantiation*, by two feigned miracles, contrary to the doctrine of the Eucharist then publicly taught, and far different from the whole scope of the Author. And the Latin Epistle written by *Ælfricke* to the Archbishop of Yorke, is to be seene mangled and razed in a Manuscript in *Bennets* colledge in Cambridge (as is well obserued by a learned Deuine) and I cannot conceiue, but it was done by some Romanist, because it doth so plainly confute the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

A N S W E R.

I. How plainly it confuteth (or rather establisheth) the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, appeareth by what I haue cited out of the same homilie, taking it as I finde it (true or false) in *M. Doctor Vsher*; for if contrarie to sence, Christs body be there after *hallowing* or Consecration: if *life* be therein: if it be *turned*, how come all these alterations, to passe without *Transubstantiation*? This is further confirmed by the two miracles your self mencion: for the nature of a miracle, is, to expresse somewhat vnto vs aboue nature, and to be admired: but the turning of bread into Christs body, supposeth this. Therefore *Transubstantiation*. The point I will not dispute with you in this place, and therefore for breuitie sake, remit you to what I haue already said against *M. Preston* pag. 47. 51. 78. 105. 106. and 107. where though I haue touched

ched these two points of the *Reall presence*, and *Transubstantiation*, but very briefly, yet perswade my selfe you will finde your selfe touched therein to the quicke. Only for a close to this discourse, who is so simple as doth not see, the sundry defects of this one Testimonie, from which, when your selfe haue taken what is for your tooth, the rest your selfe discredit as suggested? And therefore am forced both to pittie you, and to pray for you as before, saying.

2. Lord haue mercy vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercy vpon vs, to see with what poore and sillie eyes vnlearned Protestants reade such poore and sillie bookes, and to see with what poore and sillie shifts, learned Protestants seeke to delude their ignorant Readers! To see *Sir Humfrey*, who prouokes to only Scripture, as the sole Rule of his Religion, now six yeares since, to haue *Twelue* seuerall places of expresse Scripture, brought against him for prooffe of the Reall presence (*Plea pag. 40.*) and yet to this present neuer answering the, but secretly dissembling them, to stir a new the same coales, and to say nothing of the old quarrell, nor retort so much as one only text in his owne defence! Your Catalogue *Sir Humfrey* come out with your Catalogue, sith your selfe confesse; *It is an vndouted truth and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages.* Sith the sacred text, the Sole Rule whereto you appeale, assureth vs. And he gaue some Apo-

bles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the ministrie, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ (aske the Apostle now how long they were to continue, and him selfe will tell you) vntill we meet all in the vniuersitie of faith.

Parag. III.

Transubstantiation.

Sir Humfrey pag. 100.

Looke vpon their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and you shall see how miserably their Church is divided, touching the Antiquitie and Vniuersallitie of that point of faith. Some deriue it from the words of Christ; Others from Christs benediction, before the words were vttered; some from the exposition of the Fathers; others from the Councell of Lateran; some from the authoritie of the Scriptures; others from the determination of the Church.

A N S W E R.

I haue often told you, Sir Humfrey; *Quis innocens erit, si accusasse sufficiat?* Who shall escape Scot-free if it suffice alone to accuse? This Paragraph is long, and I must auoide prolixitie what I may,
for

for feare leaft otherwise I be too long. Omitting therefore your accusations, I will hasten to your testimonies, whereof your first are these that follow.

Sir Humfrey pag. 102.

It was the great vaunt of *Campian* the Iesuit. If the Protestants name the gospell, *We ioyne With them: the very Wordes are for vs.* This is my body: this is my blood. And *Bellarmino*, his fellow Iesuit, professeth confidently, that the words; *This is my bodie, constitute the essence of the Sacrament, and are operative.* If we shall further question at what time; whether before or after the words spoken, there is a conuersion of the elements into the body & blood of Christ, *Aquinas* tells vs, that the very last instance of the deliuerie of these Wordes, is the first instance of Christs body in the Sacrament, but in all the time before, there is the substance of bread remainyng.

A N S W E R.

1. What say you, *Sir Humfrey* against these three first testimonies of your owne choosing? Against these three Roses of our Religion? Wherin will you tax them? Wherin will touch or accuse them. And first, what say you to *Campian*, who affirmeth the very wordes of the gospell to be for vs? Dare you to deny this? What say you to *Bellarmino*, who auerreth that the wordes of Christ constitute the essence of the Sacrament, and are operative? Dare you deny this? If yea, name vnto vs those other wordes, besides those of Christs, that

that constitute the essence thereof: and tell vs in plaine tearmes, that those of Chrills, are not operative, nor effect or worke ought at all. What say you to that last testimony of *S. Thomas*, touching the *time* whē Chrills body first beginneth to be in the Sacrament, whether before or after the Sacramentall words be spoken? Turne the question to your selfe, and tell vs your Answer. You teach that Chrills body is in the Sacrament spirituallly, and is truly taken and eaten by faith, of the Receiver. We make the same demand to you, you do to vs. *At what time, whether before, or after the words spoken*, is this spirituall presence made? Lord what poore and triuiall stufte is this, which is to easilie retorted vpon your selfe! You can not name the expresse time, when this spirituall presence of Christ is made in your Sacrament; no expresse Scripture proueth the same; some of you say one thing, some another about this principall point of faith; therefore there is no such Sacrament at all; nor no such spirituall presence at all as you pretend. I pray, *Sir Humfrey*, how doth this inference please your humour? But along to the rest, that so by degrees we may get forward in this crooked and crabbed Way.

Sir Humfrey pag. 306.

Gabriel Biel. How the body of Christ is in the Sacrament. *Non inuenitur in canone Biblia:* it is not expressed in the canon of the Bible.

A N-

A N S W E R.

1. This authority, makes directly against you: nothing at all against vs. The verity of the presence of Christs body, is confessed: the difficultie is only *de modo*, the manner how the same is wrought; which is as hard for you to tell of your spirituall presence, as it is for vs of ours, for ought you are able to proue out of your owne Bible. What meane you then to produce such proofes, as put your selues vnto such plunges?

Sir Humfrey ibid.

Cardinall de Alliaco. *That maner, or meaning, which supposeth the substance of bread to remaine still, is possible; nether is it contrary to reason, nor to the authority of the Scriptures. Nay, it is more easie and more reasonable to conceiue, if it could accord with the determination of the Church.*

A N S W E R.

1. This of the Cardinall, maketh for vs, and against you. *First*, because nothing is impossible vnto God. *Secondly*, because it is nether contrary to reason, nor authority of Scriptures, as the Cardinall saith. *Thirdly*, because *Martin Luther*, the first founder of your new faith, held this point of *Consubstantiation* wherof you speake: will you oppose to great a Patriarch? But to be shorter, and without Repetition of your wordes, to refer the Reader to your booke.

2. That

2. That of *Bilshop Fisher*, You haue depraued: as I haue proued pag.280. Wherto I remit you.

3. That of *Durand*, conioynes the blessing of *Christ*, and the word together. What can you say against this doctrine? You cannot deny that *Christ* blessed. Why haue you laid the same aside?

4. That of *Odo*, makes also for vs, and against you: wherein the very naming of those elements with those honorable Titles of *Body* and *Blood*, was both to blesse them, and to make them to be that he named them. When God said of clay; This is *man*. Of a bone of *Adam*, This is *woman*. Of *water* at the mariage, This is *wine*. And lastly, of *bread*, This is my *Body*, those very words, did both blesse, and also cause the creatures so blessed to become that which they were not before; In a word, they were operative. Can you contradict this? Or will you wrangle against the truth by questioning with captious cauills, whether these seuerall changes were effected, before or after the words them selues were pronounced?

5. That of *Cardinall Caietan* confessing to haue receiued the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* from the Church, wherein doth this wholsome confession offend your eares? Did you not receiue your Bible from the Church, will you therefore esteeme it the lesse, or cast it from you?

6. To that of *Christophorus of Casarea*, I suppose he was a Grecian, & the Greeks by schisme, being separated from the Church of Rome, we are not bound to vphould their seuerall sayings,

no

no more then we are of *G. Cassander, Erasmus*, and others named by you, cut off from the Communion of the Catholique Church.

7. That of Cardinall *Bellarmino* pag. 110. dissenteth not from the doctrine of other schoolemen. Who all say, and consent in this, that it is hard to proue by expresse scripture, so as to enforce a refractarie man to beleue the same, Christ *Iesus* to be the naturall Sonne, and Consubstantiall with the eternall Father, and the same they say of Transubstantiation: the scripture saying as plainly and as expressely; *This is my body which shall be crucified for you*, as the same scripture saith; *This is my well beloued Sonne in whom I am wel pleased, heate yee him*. Besides, your selues admitting Christs presence in your Supper & Sacrament (let it be how, and after what sort you please) *When, how, & after what maner* is it effected? Is it made by the blessing, without the prolation of the Sacramental words? I know no blessing that you make: and so it will follow you make iust nothing. Doth your liuely faith cause that presence? Then the wordes of Christ are vaine and frutelesse. Do the Sacramentall words, after benediction, effect the same? I feare you will stagger hereat to affirme any such force to be in the wordes. From whence I thus conclude against you in your owne wordes. If your spirituall preséce be nether caused by Christs benediction, before the Sacramentall words are vttered: nor by your liuely faith without the words: nor by the force of the words themselves, then

then there being no expresse words in holy Scripture to proue your imagined spirituall presence, your doctrine in this point must needes be doubtfull : and we all know and confesse, that a doubtfull opinion, cannot be made an Article of faith.

Sir Humfrey pag. 112.

I proceed from Scriptures, to Fathers. *Alphonsus a Castro*, was a diligent reader and obseruer of the ancient Fathers, yet after great studie, and long search in their writings, returnes this answer. Of the conuersion of the body and blood of Christ, there is seldome mention in the ancient Fathers.

A N S W E R.

1. To come from scriptures (whereof you haue not alleadged the least sillable for your defence) to the Fathers. *Alphonsus a Castro* his saying, serues your turne nothing at all: for, *seldome mention*, supposeth some mention. Ergo there was some mention, according to this Author, in the ancient Fathers, of the conuersion of bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ.

2. That of *Ioannes Triburne*, makes for vs, and against you ; What meane you to produce such places as make so manifestly against your selfe?

3. That of *Maldonat*, you abute, and yet it makes nothing for you. For, *to be almost the same*, is not to be the very same. *Almost* was neuer hanged, as the prouerb saith. I confesse indeed, that *Calum*, sometimes speakes so like a Catholique, in this very question,

question, that one almost would verely censure him for such: who, so inconstant is he in his opinion of the Reall presence, that what he buildeth with one hand, he pulleth downe with the other, and what he establisheth in one place, he quite ouerturneth in another. See how liuely D. Stapleton hath described him in this kinde, in his *Discourse of the Doctrine of Protestants*?

4. To that of *Theodoret*; that you may not deceiue your selfe nor others, with the false pretence of any testimonie taken from him, what say you to these that doe ensue? *Non solum undecim Apostolis &c. And he gaue not only to the eleuen Apostles, but also to Iudas the Traitor, his pretious body and blood.* Where is to be noted, that according to this auncient Father, Christ gaue to Iudas, not only his body (for then might you wrest it to the figure of his body) but he gaue him, *his pretious body*: to wit, his owne, true, reall, and substantiall body: for other pretious body, for the vnaptinesse of Iudas, he could not giue him.

5. Take another saying of the same Father, which followeth a litle after the former, *Illud autem; Erit reus corporis & sanguinis &c. As touching that; he shall be guiltie of the body and blood of our Lord: it signifieth this, that as Iudas betrayed him, and the Iewes mocked and reuiled him, euen so do they dishonor and disworship him, that with vncleane hands, receiue his most holy body, and put it into a filthy and defiled mouth.* Where note, that *Theodoret*, doth not only say, that the most holy body of Christ is receiued,

ceiued, but also that it is receiued with *bandes*, and *mouth*: which argueth inuincibly, the Reall and substantiall presence of Christs very body in the B. Sacrament, as Cardinall *Allen* hath most learnedly noted vpon this place. Parliament of Christ pag. 275. I trow, *Sir Humfrey*, touching *Theodoret*, you haue enough of these two places, and cannot but blush to see what your selfe haue said; *That it seemes Theodoret, with other Fathers. Were ignorant of the greatest mysteries of our saluation; and S. Austen did not rightly vnderstand the corporall presence.*

6. Pag. 114. You next come in with *Cusanus*, which Author I haue not, as many more which you produce by reason of the penurie of my poore studdie, not so well furnished with bookes as yours. Nor if I had, you cite not the place where I should finde the words alleadged by you. So, this is to send vs to seeke a needle, in a botle of hay. Lets come to *Scotus*.

7. Pag. 115. *Scotus* tells you nothing that ether will helpe you, or hindervs. For, as *Scotus* saith, the name of *Transubstantiation* might be imposed by the Councell of *Lateran*, though the doctrine was beleued long before: like as the name of *Trinitie* and *Consubstantiation*, was imposed by the Councell of *Nice*, though the truth of the doctrine were beleued long before.

8. Pag. 117. You name *Wickliffe*, and the *Waldenses*. They were wicked heretiques in other points, as I haue proued pag. 60. & 91. against

M. Preston, nor no more Protestants then the Pope of Rome: Put them into the Catalogue of your visible professors, if you will warrant them to be Protestants, and then you shall see what I will say more vnto you.

9. Pag. *ibid.* Touching *Hosliensis* and *Gaufrius* our *Proctors*, as you please to tearme them, who held (if you say true, for I haue them not to see what they say) that the substance of bread did still remaine: what doth this helpe you? Sith *Martin Luther*, your prime *Proctor*, held Christs very body and blood to be in the Sacrament, together with the very bread. Dare you auouch this for sound doctrine? Or dare you claime to haue receiued a greater light, then he who was sent of God to enlighten the whole world?

10. Pag. 118. Touching that of Bishop *Tonstall* about Transubstantiation, that the beliefe therof, was within these 500. yeares a matter of indifferencie; that may serue for answer, which was returned to the authoritie of *Scorus*. The tearme might indeed be added the, yet the doctrine beleueed long before: as in the like case of *Consubstantiation*. For further prooffe whereof I remit you to what hath bene already said against *M. Preston*, pag. 39. 47.

11. To draw to an ende of this Paragraphe touching the question of *Transubstantiation*, you haue cited the testimonies of *Campian* the Iesuit whom yee martyred, *Bellarmin* the Iesuit, *Saint Thomas* of Aquin, a Dominican Friar, *Salmeron* the Iesuit, *Suarez* the Iesuit, *Gabriel Biel*, Cardinall

de *Aliaco*, Bishop *Fisher* of *Rocheſter*, whom you likewise martyred, *Durandus*, *Odo Cameracensis*, Cardinall *Caietan*, *Chryſtophorus* Archbiſhop of *Cæſarea*, *Alphonſus* a *Caltro*, *Ioannes Tribune*, *Maldonat* the Ieſuit, *Gregorie* de *Valencia*, Cardinall *Cuſanus*, *Scorus*, *Hoſtiensis*, *Gaufridus*, and *Eraſmus*, in all five or ſix Ieſuits, three Cardinalls of *Rome*, beſides ſundry Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and Catholique ſchoolemen, al as ranck Papiſts as euer liued, except he of *Cæſarea*, and *Eraſmus*. Now, what are all theſe to purpoſe, to proue, *Where Was your Church before Luther?* For, *Fiſt*, theſe were members of our Church, not of yours. We aſke, we call, we enquire for thoſe of your owne. *Secondly*, they liued not conſequenter in euery ſeuerrall Age from Chriſt to vs; and it is your owne confeſſion, that, *the faith which Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught in the fiſt Age, had viſible profeſſors in all Ages.* *Thirdly*, Cardinalls, Archbiſhops, Ieſuits and the like, who as you ſay pag. 319. rid their horſes vp to the bridle in the blood of your Saints, how make you them members of your Church? Or how was your Church borne vp in their boſome?

12. Laſtly, if you appeale from the Doctores, to their Doctrines, and from the perſons, to their testimonies, as you vſuallie doe, there is not one of them but maketh againſt you. Not one that affirmeth Chriſt to be receiued *only* by faith, *only* ſpiritually, *only* figuratiuely, as you fancie, or the like; If there be but one alone amongſt them all that ſo teacheth, name that one, and for that ones ſake,

lake, we will enrolle you for a man of exquisite reading, else how can we choose but pitying your pouertie, implore the mercie of God for you, saying. *Lord haue meeie vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs*, to see with what poore eyes vnlearned Protestants read such books, and to see with what poore shifts learned Protestants, seeke to deceiue their vnlearned Readers? To see them oppose the reall presence, which yet is a published Article of their Churches faith, as hath already bene proued against M. Preston pag. 106. and in which faith their pretended Martyrs and Confessors, haue liued, haue dyed and shed their blood, as their best learned Doctors do still auouch, *ibid.* pag. 78. 19.

13. To conclude, your Catalogue *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, especially sith your selfe confesse, *It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages.* Sith holy scripture also (the sole Rule of your Religion) assureth vs; *And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the Ministry, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill we meete all into the vnitie of faith.* Ephes. 4. 11. These Apostles of yours, these Prophets, these Euangelists, these Pastors, these Doctors, left by Christ in your Church, as they are opposite and distinct from ours, left by him for the consummation of the

Saints, left by him for the worke of the Ministrie, left by him for the building vp of his mysticall bodie, and to continue from thence vnto his second coming; these are they which are exacted of you, this is that which you haue promised, this is that you are to performe. All besides this, is meere trifling, meere tergieration, meere deception and delusion. Draw forth that Card. Drive vs downe to the ground with that weapon; We haue Gods holy word, we haue expresse scripture for our warrant. Draw vs, or pull vs in a thousand peeces you may if you please, but neuer shall you pull vs from that sacred hould, although you should hale vs a sunder with wilde horses.

Parag. I V.

Prinat Masse pag. 120.

Sir Humfrey.

IT is decreed by the Councell of Trent; If any shall say, that Masses, in which the Priest alone doth communicate, are vnlawfull, and therefore ought to be abrogated, let him be accursed. Here is a curse proclaimed against all, or any, that shall condemne priuat Masse as vnlawfull, and herein the Protestants stand in danger of a cursing Councell: For it is an Article of the Reformed Church. *Prinat Masses, that is, the receiuing of the Eucharist by the Priest*

Priest alone, Without a competent number of communicants, is contrary to the Institution of Christ, and the practise of the primitive Church. And hence it will follow, that priuat Masse is vnlawfull, and therefore to be abrogated. Now he that curseth vs, curseth Christ that ordeined it, and God that commandeth vs to obserue it. It was the Answer in the like case, made by a right Reuerend and learned Prelat of our Church, (B. Bilson) If we haue altered any point of Christs institution, curse on in Gods name, and let your curses take effect; but if the celebration of our mysteries be answerable to his Will and Word, that first ordained them, you curse not vs Whom you would hurt, but him that your cursed tongues cannot hurt, Which is, God to be blessed for euer.

A N S W E R.

1. These indeed, ar very gay and goodly words, to gull some simple sot with all. If you haue altered any part of Christs Institution; If the celebration of your mysteries, be answerable to his Will and Word, that first ordained them, then we curse not you, but him, Whom our cursed tongues cannot hurt. Touching our cursing tongues, and cursing Councell, I haue shewed against M. Preston pag. 85. that you haue them both as well as we, and so are still beaten with your owne weapons. But to let that passe, and to come to the maine point; If you haue altered some part of Christs Institution; If the celebration of your mysteries be not answerable to his will and word (for your selfe put, and suppose

all with *Ifs*, and *Ands*) then you consent that our curses hurt you, doe you not? We will therfore put on to examine this point, and then to speake of our *Privat Masse*, as you please to stile it . To counterpoint therfore the celebration of your misterie, with that of Christs, I will first set downe certaine particulars, wherein your institutiō agrees with ours, but not with Christs, making Scripture (as you doe) the only *Rule* of your Religion: and they are these . 1. First, Christ gaue his Sacrament in the Euening: you , yours , in the Morning . 2. He his, after Supper: you, yours, fasting. 3. He his, only to men: you, yours , also to women . 4. He his, iust to the number of Twelue, and to no lesse ; you, yours to three , or foure , if there be no more; and to a hundred, if there be so manie . But in all these , you and we agree together, though nether of vs agree with Christ . 5. Christ made his Sacrament of vnleauened bread: you, yours (according to your owne Rubrique) of such as is visuallie to be eaten at the Table . 6. Christ blessed his vnleauened bread : you blesse not yours ; whereof notwithstanding *M. Iewel* saith . *This is not a ceremoniall accident, but the very end, purpose, and substance of Christs institution* (cont. *Harding*, artic. 1. Diuif. 9. pag. 23.) 7. Christ pronounced the words ouer the bread; you, at yours, remoue the words aloofe from the Elements, for feare belike they should effect what Christ intended. 8. Christ in his Supper, offered vp what he had consecrated: you, in yours doe not this. 9.

Christ

Christ in his, all the Apostles, and all the Churches that euer were from him to vs, mixed water with the wine in this sacred myserie: this you, in yours do quite omit; yet this S. Iames, S. Basil, S. Chrysostome, with S. Cyprian, doe all witnesse, who of this sacred myserie saith thus. *This our Lord did: and none rightly offereth, that doth not follow him therein. Epist. 63. ad Cecilium. n. 4. 7.* Prouing two particular thinges against Protestants; to wit, the one, that Christ offered: the other, that he mixed water with wine in that dreadfull myserie. Nether of which do you practise, who yet pretend, to haue Christ, forsooth, and the primitiue Church for the perfect patterne of your proceedings.

3. What say you now? Haue you altered any part of Christs Institution, yea or no? Is the celebration of your English myserie, answerable to his will and word, yea, or no? Haue we cause to curse you, and do we curse God, in cursing you, yea, or no? *You haue fisht faire*, as the prouerb saith, *and caught a frogge*. You haue taken the Wolfe by the eare, and yet nether dare to hould him, nor let him goe. You haue put your selfe to a strait, to a plunge, for hence it followes, that you haue altered indeed some speciall point of Christs Institution: that notwithstanding al your vaning, the celebration of your mysteries, be not answerable to his will and word: but contrarie to both, as also the practise of the primitiue Church. Hence it followes from your owne confession, that

the celebration of your English Supper is vnlawfull, and this Article of your Reformed Irish Church (which you number the hundred, more by threelcore and one, then are in your English) to be abrogated and abolished.

Sir Humfrey pag. 122.

The Communion which is vsed, together with Priest and people in our Church, is deriued from Christ himselfe (46. *vntruth.*) For the Euangelists tell vs. *Christ tooke bread, and when he had giuen thanks, he brake it, and gaue it to his Disciples; he tooke bread, that he might breake it; he brake it, that he might giue it; he gaue it, that they should eate: and so much Christs words declare, which are both plurall & spoken to others; Take yee, eate yee, not singular, or to him selfe alone.*

A N S W E R.

All this, with a great deale more, you bring *Sir Humfrey*, against *Prinat Masse*. Wherein you still change the state of the question. You should prone your owne Religion, and you spend the time wholly in disproouing of ours. You should produce your owne visible professors, distinct from ours, especially in the Ages before Luther, and you produce not one of yours before Luther. All these deceitfull turnings and wyndings of your vncoth and Crooked Way, wee must winke at, and dance after your pipe, how impertinent soeuer the dance be. I haue told you often, and can-

cannot but tell you once againe, that you labour in vaine to disproue ours, though graunted for the worst religion in the world: for that the naughtinesse of ours, nether enforces nor infers, any goodnesse in yours. But to iustifie the point of priuat Masse, which you oppose.

First, for the Masse it selfe, and that Christ him selfe said Masse. I refer you to what I haue brought against *M. Preston* pag. 45. 46. And touching the priuatnesse therof, which is the point that you oppose, wee absolutely deny, that any Masse at all is priuat, in respect of the Masse it selfe. Which as it is a Sacrifice, is comon and publique, and cannot without iniurie be accounted priuat. This is confirmed by comon reason; A conduit built in a Cittie, for the publique vtilitie of the people, is not withstanding truly comon, not Priuat, though but one in a whole weeke should fetch water at it. The banquet also, mencioned in the gospel by Christ him selfe (Matth. 22. 3.) was a Publique, not a Priuat banquet, though the guesstes invited therto, neglected to come. So is it of this blessed banquet of our Lords body.

I say *Secondly*, whereas this Sacrament consists of three essentiall parts, to wit, *Consecration*, *Oblation*, and *Communion*, it cannot without iniurie to Christs Institution, be restrained to take its denomination of *Communion* alone. Which one reason quite ouerthrowes all your pretensions against priuat Masse.

I say

I say *Thirdly*, euen Communion it selfe, is not so called, only of many peoples receiuing with the Priest, *at one Time*, and *altogether in one Place*: but because wee are all made partakers of one and the same most blessed Body, in what distant places so euer we be; So that, *it*, to wit, the thing imparted and receiued, makes the *Communion*, whether they be many, or few, whether together, or asunder, that do receiue it: according to that saying of S. Paul, 1. Cor. 10. 17. *For being many, we are one bread, one body, all that participate of one bread*; though they neither were, nor possibly can bee, all in one and the same place. According to your Creed, you say you *beleue the Communion to Saints*. Beleue you no Communion, saue only of those that assembled in one and the selfe same place? how absurd were it so to say?

I say *Fourthly*, Priuat Masse also (as you please to call it) in this case, properlie speaking, is not so called, in respect of the thing receiued, nor yet of the effects therof, but only in respect of the act of Receiuing. For if one man receiue alone, that act of his may, in some sort, be called Priuat, in respect of the Time and Place he receiueth in; but not in respect of the Sacrament it selfe which he receiueth.

I say *Fifthly*, that the doctrine of the Sacrifice is certaine in it selfe, and the Sacrificers receiuing therof, essentiall therto: but touching *Time, Place and number* of Communicants) they being all circumstances of *fact*, Christ decreed nothing for certaine

certaine in this case. Wee confesse, wee plainly proue the substance; it is therefore contention, to cavill with vs about the circumstance.

I say *Sixtly*, If the practise of the primatiue Church, be of any force with you and other Protestants in this point, I refer you to *S. Iustin Mar-Apol. 2. prope finem*: to *S. Irenaeus* and *Eusebius*, hist. lib. 5. cap. 24. to the example of *Serapion*, and *Tertullians* wife, receiuing priuatly and alone, as hath bene formerly shewed to those of your side, by *M. Reynolds* against *M. Bruce* pag. 278. By all which proofes, it is most apparent, that after solemne receiuing in the Church, the Sacrament was sent to priuat persons in their houses, euen in the most vnspotted and most pure Ages of the Church. Which once againe, quite ouerthrowes all your triuall pretences, against Priuat Masse, or the receiuing of one alone.

I say *Seauenthly*, that this may be further proued, euen from the confessions of sundry learned Protestants, who in this very point, hould plainly with vs, and against you. As *Luther*, *Oecolampadius*, *Westphalus*, and *Peter Martyr*, which last of Priuat Communion, saith thus. *This custome, although it was somewhat superstitious, yet Cyrill and other Fathers, approued it.*

Westphalus disputeth the selfe same point against *Caluin* thus. *Where is any such Rule? Any such law made by Christ? Christ neuer made any such law, concerning Time, Place, or Number. Hee neuer commanded, that the whole congregation should meete together,*

I say *Thirdly*, euen Communion it selfe, is not so called, only of many peoples receiuing with the Priest, *at one Time*, and *altogether in one Place*: but because wee are all made partakers of one and the same most blessed Body, in what distant places so euer we be; So that, *is*, to wit, the thing imparted and receiued, makes the *Communion*, whether they be many, or few, whether together, or asunder, that do receiue it: according to that saying of S. Paul, 1. Cor. 10. 17. *For being many, we are one bread, one body, all that participate of one bread*; though they nether were, nor possible can bee, all in one and the same place. According to your Creed, you say you *beleue the Communion to Saints*. Beleue you no Communion, saue of those that assembled in one and the selfe place? how absurd were it so to say?

I say *Fourthly*, Priuat Masse also (as you please to call it) in this case, properlie speaking, is not called, in respect of the thing receiued, nor yet of the effects therof, but only in respect of the act of Receiuing. For if one man receiue alone, that act of his may, in some sort, be called Priuat, in respect of the Time and Place he receiueth in; but not in respect of the Sacrament it selfe which he receiueth.

I say *Fiftly*, that the doctrine of the Sacrifice is certaine in it selfe, and the Sacrificers receiuing therof, essentiall therto: but touching *Time, Place* and *number* of Communicants) they being all circumstances of fact, Christ decreed nothing for certaine

certaine in this case. Wee confesse, wee plainly proue the substance; it is therefore contention, to cavill with vs about the circumstance.

I say *Sixtly*, If the practise of the primatiue Church, be of any force with you and other Protestants in this point, I refer you to *S. Iustin Mart. Apol. 2. prope finem*: to *S. Irenæus* and *Eusebius*, hist. lib. 5. cap. 24. to the example of *Serapion*, and *Textullians* wife, receiuing priuatly and alone, as was formerly shewed to those of your side, against *M. Bruce* pag. 278. By all this it is most apparent, that after so long a time in the Church, the Sacrament was receiued by persons in their houses, euen in the best and most pure Ages of the Church. Hence againe, quite ouerthrowes the objections, against Priuat Masse, or Communion alone.

And *seuently*, that this may be further proued in the confessions of sundry learned Fathers, who in this very point, hould plainly with vs, and against you. As *Luther*, *Oecolampadius*, *Westphalus*, and *Peter Martyr*, which last of Priuat Communion, saith thus. *This custome, although it was somewhat superstitious, yet Cyrill and other Fathers, approoued it.*

Westphalus disputeth the selfe same point against *Caluin* thus. *Where is any such Rule? Any such Law made by Christ? Christ neuer made any such Law, concerning Time, Place, or Number. Hee neuer commanded, that the whole congregation should meete together,*

together, and in one Time and Place, receiue the Sacrament. You are they who make such a law at your pleasure. Christ neuer forbad, that a few, three, two, or one, should participate this heathfull food. He promised to bee present in the midst of two or three, gathered together in his name &c. and will he not stand to his promise, yea, though one alone receiue the Eucharist?

And meeting with that obiection, that it is a common Supper and banquet, and therefore not to be receiued priuately, this learned Protestant, as if he personally opposed Sir Humfrey, vpon this confession and ground, maketh an argument cleane contrary, saying thus. *Quid audio? What heare I? Shall it not be accounted a Supper? Is it against the nature of a Supper, of a Communion or Communication, if one alone, or but a few, bee refreshed at it? Christ mercifully ordayned his Supper to refresh hungry soules. He ordained a Communion. By order of his Institution, no man that desireth it, is to bee excluded, but by right of this common Supper, is to bee admitted though he be alone &c. except by his impenitence hee debar him selfe.*

And hauing proued this point, by sundry examples of the primitive Fathers, as out of S. Cyprian, S. Austen, and Dionysius of Alexandria, hee saith thus. *And Caluine &c. Hearest thou friend Caluin, that Dionysius of old iudged, that the sick were defrauded of a great benefit, by those who denyed them the Communion of the Eucharist? It is not the Will of God, but a policie of the Diuel to deny the Communion*

union priuately, which is ordayned by Christ to strengthen the faith of euery priuat man, for euery priuat man to apply to him selfe, the benefit of Christ, and comfort him selfe with remission of his sinnes. Thus this learned Protestant, cited by M. Reynolds against Bruce pag. 283. & 285. Loe Sir Humfrey, haue you not spunne a faire thrid, when euen a learned man of your owne side, proueth this point against you by so many good reasons; and moreouer plainly telleth you, that it is not the will of God, but a policie of the Diuel, to oppose priuat Masse? Here haue you got againe the Wolfe by the eare, and are in the selfe same strait you were before, whether you should hold, or let him goe. But to fortune this point with some other proofes.

I say *Eighthly*, this is to bee proved from the definition of a Sacrament, which is thus defined by your selues, *A visible signe of inuisible grace.* Now, the Sacrament is before the vnion, yea, or no. If no, then the Acte on the Receiuers part, should seeme to giue the grace to the Sacrament: not the Sacrament it selfe to the Receiuer. If before? Then one, receiuing alone, must needes be confest to receiue the grace of the Sacrament. A troublesome knot, Sir Humfrey, to vntie.

I say *Ninthly*, that the same may bee proued, from the absurdities, which may, and doe ensue of the contrary doctrine. For, if according to the exact order of your Cōmunion booke, although there be not aboute twentie parsons in a parish, yet
there

there shall be no Communion, except three at least communicate with the Minister, it would follow, that the Apostles though hauing receiued the grace of the holy Ghost, and power to preach the gospell, and administer the Sacraments to such as should beleeue in Christ, if coming into some place or house, where they conuerted but one or two (which often hapned) and one, or both of them lying at the point of death, desirous to receiue that comfortable foode before his departure (Christ hauing said. Vnlesse you eate the flesh of the Sonne of man &c. you shall not haue life in you) by this wicked doctrine, the partie should be suffered to die without the same, nor the priest of God might not communicate him, vntill there were a greater number presēt. How truly said *Westphalus* that to deny the Communion priuately, was a policie of the Deuill?

I say Tenthly, I finde amongst you (and that in great numbers) two seuerall sorts of people, and two seuerall sorts of opinions, about your Sacrament and receiuing. One is of those, who say they receiue not the bodye of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, but only that they receiue by faith, the frutes and graces which flow from the same; of which opinion your selfe, and *M. Preston* seeme to be, both denying the Reall presence. Now I demand of you, or of any other of that opinion. May a particular man, euermore, and euery where, out of the Sacrament of the Supper, receiue Christ by faith, yea, or no? If yea, why not also

also in the Sacrament? Or what neede any man, care for Christ in the Sacrament (which the Minister cannot giue to him and his wife, though they would receiue the same at his hands both together) which he may receiue alone by him selfe, without ether their helpe, or company? How wittily therefore said *Westphalus*, that to oppose *private Communion*, was a policie of the Diuell?

I say Eleaventhly, that there are manie other amongst you of another mind, which beleeue they receiue from heauen, the bodie of Christ spirituallie, although what they receiue from the hāds, of the Minister, be nothing else but bakers bread. Now according to your English order, three at least must receiue together, and lesse then three, make no Communion; But one, yea two of those three, may hap to receiue vnworthelie, and according to you, he that receiueth vnworthelie, receiues not Christ, nor nothing else but bare bread. If two, or any one of the three, receiue not Christ, nether doth the third also. If one of the three notwithstanding receiue Christ, then receiuing of one alone is approued. For may a man alone receiue the bodie of Christ from heauen, when others do not (which is by far the greater matter) and may he not without the breach of Christs institution, receiue bread and wine alone at the Ministers hands (by many degrees far inferior to the body of Christ?) May he enioye the principall alone, and must he be debarred from the accessorie, only because he is alone? your selfe iudge if *Westphalus* much

much mistooke the marke, when he said of this doctrine, that it *was a policie of the Diuell.*

I say Twelfthly that this doctrine seemes to be contrary to sacred scripture, which thus I proue. He that said to moe. *I say to you but vnlesse you haue penance, you shall all likewise perish* Luc. 13. said to one alone, *At what time soeuer a sinner repenteth him of his sinnes from the bottome of his hart, I will put all his wickednes out of my remembrance.* Againe, he who said of moe: *Going therefore, teach yee all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost.* Mar 28. said of one alone, *he that beleueth and is baptised, shall be saued,* Marc. 16. 16. Euen so, he that said to many, *Take yee, eate yee,* in the plurall, said of one alone in the singular; *If any man eate of this bread, he shall liue for euer.* And againe, *he that eateth me, shall liue by me. He that eateth this bread, shall liue for euer.* Iohn 6. 51. 58. 59. Sith therfore this doctrine of yours, is contrarie to comon sense; contrary to the iudgment of sundrie learned Protestants; implyeth such abturdities; and contrarie also to holie Scripture, rightlie said *Westphalus*, that it *was a policie of the Diuell*, and trulie I beleuee no lesse. But pardon me, for I haue dwelt too long vpon this point, and must be briefer vpon the rest.

Sir Humfrey pag. 122. 123.

After Christs passion, the Apostle *S. Paul* giues this charge to the Corinthians. *1. Cor. 11. 1. Be yee followers of me, euen as I also am of Christ.* And
in

in the same chapter he shewes wherein they should imitate Christ. When yee come together (to eate the Lords supper) *tarrie one for another*, that yee may not come together vnto condemnation: and as if he had foretould by the spirit of prophecie, the doctrine of these times, he puts the questiō forcible to the Masse Priests. *The cup of blessing which we blesse, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ?* as if he had said; therfore it is called a Communion, because it is a comon vnion of Priests and people.

A N S W E R.

1. This place of holy Scripture, you deprave *Sir Humfrey* notoriouslie, both corrupting the text it selfe, and falsifying the minde and purpose of the Apostle. The Apostle saith *verse 33. When you come together to eate, tarrie one for another.* You thus. *When you come together to eate (the Lords supper) tarrie one for another:* adding to the text to establish your heresie, these words, *the Lords supper.* Who now I pray are they, that for aduantage of their cause, by *shiftes and cauils*, turne the necks of Scriptures cleane about, so to wrest them to their owne side? (pag. 42.) know you none by name that vse this wicked practise? If you do not, I will tell you of one, that you may take the better heede of him: it is a knight cald *Sir Humfrey*, who that he might the more smoochlie, and with lesse suspition put in practise this wicked art, makerh a solemne protestation in his Epistle Ded. to all the Gentry of the kingdome, that he hath witnessed a true confession before God

and man, that he hath nether wilfully, nor wittingly, falsified any one Author, ether in citation or translation in this Treatise, and yet falsifieth no meaner an Author, then S. Paul him selfe; What shall we say to such a man? But more of this in his proper place, and which I haue speciallie referued for this purpose.

2. Nor haue you abused this great Secretarie of our Lords, by adding to his words of your owne, in the selfe same letter, but you do further by such addition, falsie the mind and purpose of the Apostle, these wordes of his being meant and vnderstood by him, of the Church-seasts of the *Corinthians*, not of the sacred Communion, as you suppose, and as by the scope and purpose of the text it selfe, doth plainly appeare. For, the custome of the primitiue Christians was, about the time of the Churches Sacrifice, to keepe great & solemne feasts for the reliefe of the poore, vpon the purse and comon charges of the richer and more Noble sort: for which you may see *Terrullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *S. Iustine* and *S. Austen*, cited by the *Rhemists* vpon this place, all things in those blessed times, being as scripture saith, comon amongst thole first Christians. But this godly custome, grew at last amongst them to a disorder, which the Apostle therfore endeouored by writing to them, to reforme. Willing (as *D. Harding* against *Iewel*, hath learnedly noted (*Reioyndre* pag. 92.) the more noble sort, that they should not neglect nor despise the poore, but to *adwaite and tarrie for them,*
and

and to admit them charitably and humbly, to be partakers of their Table, as Christ admitted all his Apostles to be partakers of his table indifferently. Adding that, S. Paul doth not there exhort or stir the Corinthians to a publique Communion, or to the receiving of the Sacrament with a number, but to charity, indifferencie, meekenesse, equall regard of their poore bretheren, humilitie, moderation and sobrietie.

3. You haue depraue therefore this place of Scripture notoriously, perverting both the words and purpose of the Apostle; yea it is plaine that without that perfidious addition (*the Lords supper*) this place serues nothing at all to your purpose. For tell me I pray you, was either Christ or S. Paul, a companion or follower of such drunken feasts, as the Apostle there complaineth of? Who, in good faith, can now but symle at you, to see you thus putting the question forcibly to the masse-priests? Or where in all Christendome, haue the Masse-priests any such custome as this, to banquet with good fat Chickins and Capons in the Church, before, or at the time of Communion? I pittie, Sir Humfrey, from my very hart, your vndertaking, to see how poorly you vindicatly your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation. But to turne at last to your Authorities.

Sir Humfrey pag. 122.

Cardinall Hogo saith. It is called a Communion, for that the people in the primitive Church, did communicate euery day (together.)

A N S W E R.

1. The Euangelist Saint Mat. Cap. 22. 15. telleth vs, that *the Pharises conspired among themselves, for to entrap Iesus, in his talke*. You haue here produced twentie seuerall testimonies (all but one, if I mistake not) out of Catholique Authors, for prooffe of this one particular point: and iust as the Pharises did by our Sauour *Iesus*, so your whole endeuour is, to entrap his seruants in their talke: and yet when all is done, it will not be: not one of these places will serue your purpose, and the seruants of *Iesus*, haue put you to silence. To come to the particulars.

2. That of Cardinall *Hugo*, makes nothing at all against vs. We grant it may for that respect, be called a Communion: but not *only*, or for that respect *alone*, which is the maine point you are to proue: because if so, your English Communion, should be no Communion at all, for doe your people communicat every day? Are you not faine often to excommunicat once a yeare? In a word, all the force this Authoritie hath against vs, consists in this one word (*together* :) which by your vpright dealing in this one place, you haue put in such a letter, as shewes the word to be your owne addition. Take this one word (*together*) away, and all the rest is not worth a straw to proue your purpose: Obserue this sincerity still in your citations, and all will goe well. Had you dealt thus with that place of *S. Paul*. I should haue said but
little

Or, the Truly Safe way.
little to you. To proceed to the rest.

387

Sir Humfrey pag. 144.

Looke vpon the Ancient Councels in the Roman Church, and they are witnessles of our doctrine without exception. It was ordained by the Councell of *Nantes*, that no Priest should presume to celebrate the solemnities of the Masse, alone: for, say they, *to Whom doth the Priest say, The Lord be with you? And, Lift vp your hearts? And, We giue thanks vnto the Lord, when there is none to make answer? Or Whom doth he inuite to pray with him? Therefore let this ridiculous superstition, be banished from the cloisters of Monkes.*

A N S W E R.

1. I pittie you, *Sir Humfrey*, more and more, to see how palpable you seeke to deceiue; Can you not distinguish betwixt the solemnities of the Masse, and the Receiving of the people? Or is there no solemnitie at all, ether in our Latin Masse, or your English Lyturgie, besides the Act of only Receiving? I trow a Minister might do amisse, if he should lock him selfe into the Church, and there celebrate your English solemnities all alone, without a Clearck or any other to make him answer. Yet not do so much amisse (hauing one or two in his cōpany) to receive alone for his soules comfort, if being at the Communion Table, hee felt he fainted sodainly, and none to communicate but him selfe alone. For should you deny

him this comfort in such a case, how might not *Westphalus* truly tell you? *It is a policie of the Diuel.*

2. As for the words of the Councell them selues, I haue them not (so poore I am of such rich prouision,) But supposing they are truly cited by you, wherein make they against vs? Surely nothing that I can see, vnlesse you can proue that our Priests say Masse at this day so priuatlie, that there is nether man nor boy, to make them Answer. Thousands of Masses haue I seene in my dayes, but such a madde Masse as you imagine, I neuer saw. It is a calummie. You seeke to deceiue too too sensible. And which I may not omit without remark, the very authoritie you bring against vs, maketh much against your selfe. For if it bee true which you tell vs (as it is most true) that this was the resolution of an ancient Council in the Roman Church, and this ancient Councell, receiued this for the better expelling of *superstition from the Cloisters of Monkes*: then followes it well, that *there were Monkes in the ancient Roman Church*, which we see at this day to bee quite banished out of your English. Here againe haue you got the wolfe I told you by the eare, and therefore cannot but pittie you, to see how rudely you looke about you.

3. Page 125. That against Pope *Innocent*, is a meere fiction of your owne fayning. What hee said that the Angels assist those that pray, herein he said no more then *S. Chrysostome*, and other Saints haue said before him. That of *Bellarmino* in the

in the same page, is in a maner the same you vrge against Pope Innocent, who had no cause at all to imagine that those words of of the Masse (*as many of vs as haue receiued the Sacrament*) would bee thought a mockerie. For all Priests thorough out the world saying so, and many hundred thousand of Priests, receiuing the Sacrament euery day, he might very well rendre the meaning, for those that did communicat else where, without committing any kinde of contradiction. Nay, many words of the like nature, are, as I wote, in your owne Communion booke, and extended also to the absent, or else I wote, it is a most vncharitable and most vnchristian kinde of Communion.

Sir Humfrey pag. 126.

Cochleus. Anciently all the Priests and people, did communicate together, as appeareth by the Canons of the Apostles, and Writings of Ancient Fathers: but now since the order of communicating together hath ceased by the negligence of Priests, and Pastors, the holy Ghost hath taught vs a remedy against their slouthfulness in celebrating of Priuie Masse.

A N S W E R.

1. You should haue done well, *Sir Humfrey*, in my iudgment, to haue left out this testimonie, with many moe that follow after, which make so little for the credit of your English Communion. Anciently indeed, both Priests and people, did communicate euery day. Where are the steps of

this practise in your repured Church? Euery priest at this present with vs, that possiblie may without vrgent impediment, doth communicate euery day. What do your godlie ministers in the meane while? What remedie hath the Holy Ghost taught your Reformed Church, against their slouthfulnes in this most holy and primitiue patterne?

Sir Humfrey pag. 132.

Thus you haue heard, many of the best learned Romanists, witnessing the Antiquitie of our doctrine, and consequently intimating the noueltie of their owne &c.

A N S W E R.

1. From the Councell of *Nantes* pag. 124. to this present place pag. 132. you haue cited sundry authorities to improue (as you call it) *priuat Masse*, amongst which truly, there are very few to bee found, which make not much for vs, and against you. What meane you to produce such testimonies, as make so much against your selfe? You cite the Councell of *Nantes* for the celebration of Masse, which your selfe call, an *Ancient Councell*. That of *Innocent* 400. yeares since, for prooffe of his Popedome, and of Masse. That of *Cochleus*, makes the Masse as ancient, as the Canons of the Apostles. That of *Durandus*, deriues the Masse from the primitiue Church. That of *Odo* doth the like. That of *Beletus*, doth no lesse. That of Cardinall *Hugo*, is conforme. That of

Durandus

Duyandus, that from the very infancie of the Church, the sacred myſteries were celebrated with giuing of bleſſing; is not this quite miſſing in your late Reformed myſteries? That of *Micrologus* for quotidian Communion, we ſtill retayne, but you do not. That of *Caffander*, wee except againſt, as none of ours. That of *Innocentius* of greeting with a kiſſe (praſtiſed in the Apoſtles times) wee praſtiſe the ſame euen at this preſent: what praſtiſe therof, is there in the Church of Proteſtants? That of *Hoffmeiſterus* and M. Doctor *Harding*, we freely grant you, much good may they do you. That of *Iuſtinian*, and anciently vſed in the Greek Church, is ſtill conſerued in the Church of Rome; what is become of this ancient cuſtome, to hallow bread, in your Reformed Churches?

2. It is, as I take it, a rule of equitie, that the witneſſe which any one bringeth againſt another, hee ought not to reiect, the ſame being brought againſt him ſelfe. Now you, *Sir Humfrey*, would haue theſe teſtimonies to be credited, yea, or no? If you would haue them to bee of weight againſt vs, it ſeemeth reaſon your ſelfe ſhould not reiect them, but be contented to be iudged by them: which if you bee, in what a world of things will you bee found, to deuiaſt from the primitive praſtiſe? I will not be iudge in myne owne cauſe, but plainly and really remit my ſelfe to the iudgment of the impartiall and indifferent Reader: for hauing endeouored to proue this one point of
your

your doctrine, from the testimonie of our Doctors, you haue not only sayled therin, but quite contrary, euen as if God would enforce you to witnesse his truth against your will, you haue clearly proued and iustified, sundry points of our profession, as Masse, the profession of Monkes, Popedome, blessing in the Masse, daylie Communion, greeting with a holy kisse in the time of the mysteries, and the ancient vse of making holy bread, longe since practised, as well in the Greek, as the Latin Church; and yet notwithstanding (o strange that the Reader can not discouer this deceit) you dare to boast, that we haue *Witnessed the Antiquitie of your doctrine, and intimated the Noueltie of our owne!* Where quite contrary, you haue in very truth witnessed the Antiquitie of ours, and the Noueltie of yours; and that in no lesse then six seuerall points, euen there where you paine your selfe, to proue but one, yet cannot performe it!

Sir Humfrey ibid.

And it seemes the learned Fathers of the Trent Councell, were very sensible of that doctrine, which the Ancient Fathers taught and proclaymed for the right Communion in their Church; and therupon you shall obserue the Councel concludes in that Canon of Priuat Masse, with a well wishing to the Ptoestant Doctrine. (47. *Vntruth.*) *Operaret quidem Sacro sancta Synodus &c.* The sacred Councell could wish, that the faithfull people
Which

Which stand by, would communicate with the Priest; not only in spirituall affection, but in Sacramentall participation; and the reason is there rendred by the Councell: because it would bee more fruitfull, and more profitable for the Receiuer. Should out of the same mouth proceedes cursing and blessing &c.

A N S W E R.

1. I pittie you, *Sir Humfrey*, who so far overshoot your selfe, and so palpable seek to deceive your simple Reader. You endeavour to catch the Councell of Trent in a contradiction, as if there had at once proceed out of the selfe same mouth, both cursing and blessing. I could you before, that you do but labour, to entrap *Iesus* in his talke; and therefore say vnto you as the same *Iesus* said to *S. Paul*, *It is hard for thee to kick against the prick*: and as hard for you (*Sir Humfrey*) to kick against that sacred Councell. Wee haue proued vnto you, that the receiuing of the Priest alone, when ether many, or but one or two are present, that do asist him at the Altar, (though not receiue) make it not a Priuat Masse; The reason I haue rendred; because, that one, may receiue with the Priest (if he will) being duly prepared. The banquet is readie: the feast is publique: shall the slouthfulnesse of the inuited, bee any preiudice to the great bountie of God who hath made ready the banquet? When of fortie of yours that ar in one parish, and but four of them
come

come to communicate, would not the Minister wish that all the rest did receive with him, not only in spirituall affection, but also in Sacramentall participation? What contradiction were in this? How should blessing and cursing for such a wishe, proceede out of one and the same Ministers mouth? Can you tell how schollars define a contradiction? Surely by this it seemeth no, and that the cōtradictiō is in your owne head, & your owne wit, not in the words of that holie Councel, which was so far from any least *Well Wishing* to your Protestant doctrine, that it was cald, assembled, and gathered together out of the coasts of the Christian world, for no other end then to condemne it. Call you that, a *Well Wishing* to it? I blesse my selfe, to see how palpably you seeke to deceiue.

Sir Humfrey pag. 134.

But put the case, saith M. Harding, *that the people might be stirred to such deuotion, as to dispose themselves worthely to receive their housel euery day with the Priest; as they did (in the primitive Church) What would these men haue to say? Surely, if our aduersaries would leaue their Priuat Masse, and returne to our Communion, agreeable to the practise of Christ, and his Apostles, I presume these men, that is, the Protestants would say, that the Masse Priests neede not then so much complaine of the Noueltie of our doctrine &c.*

A N S W E R.

1. Still poorer and poorer. Still, *Sir Humfrey*, you seeke to deceiue your ignorant Reader. For wee might, euen in your sence, leaue our Priuat Masse to morrow next, and be stirred vp to such deuotion, as to receiue our houses daylie with the Priest, and yet not returne to your Protestā^t Communion. We might approue the Antiquitie of the one, and yet dispise the Nouelie of the other. Your Protestant Communion, and the practise therof, resembles that of Christs, and the primitiue Church, iust as an Aple doth an Oshter. Turne but back to page 372. there shall you see the disparitie laid before you. And thus it seemes you take delight to say much, and to proue litle, as if you had purchaled some speciall priuiledg, to say what you list, and to proue what you please. But you must know, *Sir Humfrey*, your bare assertion, is with vs, accounted lighter then any fether, and your naked wordes, only emptie puffes of winde. Proue what you say out of Gods word, or with such solid and weightie testimonies, as will beare water, then on Gods name beare it away.

2. To conclude this 4. Paragraph, you haue produced against priuat Masse, these testimonies and authorities. *Hugo Cardinali*; The Councell of *Nantes*, Pope *Innocent* the third, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, *Cochleus*, *Durandus Miramensis*, *Odo Cameracensis*, *Belesbus*, *Durandus Tholosanus*, *Micrologus*,
Ioannes

Ioannes Hoffmeisterus (who what he is I cannot tell) *M. Doctor Harding*, *Iustinian* the Emperor, and the Councell of *Trent*. Now; how for Gods sake, make you Popes, Cardinals, Catholique Councels, Iesuits, and Catholique Doctors (men who wrote *ex professo* to extirpate and roote out your Religion) members of your Reformed Church? How make you men, who rode their horses vp to their bridles in the blood of your Saints, to conclude with a *well willing*, to your new deuised doctrine? Who euer heard of such a deuise? Who euer excogitated such a Chymera? How needlesse to refute so ridiculous a fable? How pithily doth that venerable Father, that Ancient writer, and lantern of Religious men *Vincentius Lyrinenfis*, hit you home in his Golden Treatise cap. 3. taxing the heretiques of his time, for vsing the selfe same

”tricks that you do now, laying? They, endeou-
 ”ring vnder the cloake of an other mans name, co-
 ”ningly to frame an heresie, commonly lay holde
 ”of some darke sayings of one auncient Father or
 ”other, which by reason of the obscurity, may seem
 ”to make for their opinion, to the end they may be
 ”thought that whatsoeuer, I know not what, they
 ”bring forth to the world, neither to haue bene the
 ”first that so taught, neither alone of that opinion:
 ”whose wicked deuce, in mine opinion, is worthy
 ”of dubble hatred; both for that they feare not to
 ”sow their poisoned seed of heresy amongst others,
 ”and also because they blemish the memorye of
 ”some holy man, and as it were with prophane
 ”handes,

handes, cast his dead ashes into the wind, bringing infamously that to light, which rather with silence were to be buried; following therein the steps of their Father *Cham*, who not only neglected to couer the nakednes of venerable *Noe*, but also shewed it to others to laugh at, by which fact of his, he incurred so great a crime of impietie, that his posteritie was subiect to the malediction of his sinne: his blessed bretheren doing far otherwise, who neither with their owne eies, would violate the nakednesse of their reuerend Father, nor yet permit it to remaine vncovered for other to behold, but going backward, as the holy text saith, they couered him: which is as much to say, that they neither approued with harte, nor blased with tong, the holy mans fault; and therfore they and their posterity were rewarded with their Fathers blessing. Thus this Father eleuen hundred yeares since, which laid before you, I remit you further to that which hath already bene said pag. 124. against *M. Preston*, treating of the defectiuenes of his couerfet *Catalogue*, where you may see as in a glasse, the spots and deformities of this your poore and vaine pretension, thinking thus like an other *Moyse*, to take a *Papist* by the taile, and presently to turne him into a *Protestant*.

3. Meane while, tell me, *Sir Humfrey*, how doth this sorrie conceit of the two Sisters, this lodging and harbouring of your selues in our bosome, this prouing of the Antiquitie of your doctrine, only by, and from our confessions, hange together? For, ether

ether you are able to bring testimonies of your owne, without being behoulding at all to vs, or you are not. Ether you can produce visible professors in *every age* from Christ to *Luther*, of your owne, and distinct from ours, or you can not. If you can: why produce you them not, it being the thing particularly exacted of you? If you can, and haue great plentie and store of your owne, what base beggarie, and counterfet pouertie is it, to borrow all of vs? If you haue none, distinct and a part from vs; then we only hauing the visible professors from Christ to vs, it followes inuincibly, that we only haue had the true visible profession from Christ to vs: true profession, by your owne confession, being inseperable from true professors. Epist Ded. pag. 3.

4. But why strue I, why contend I, to grauel you with humane reasons, when with that vnresistable sword (the word of God) I am able to driue you downe to the ground? When with that alone, I am able to dissipate and to dissolue into Imoke, this sillie deuise? this Chymera of being harboured, of being imbreasted in our bosome? What answer returne you to these texts of scripture?

Leuit. 19. 19. *Thy field thou shalt not sow with diuers seedes. A garment that is wouen of two sorts, thou shalt not put on. Out therefore Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.*

Deut. 22. 9. *Thou shalt not sow thy vineard with diuers seeds &c. Thou shalt not plough with an Oxe and*

and Asse together. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey of our bosome.

Ecclesiasticus 2. 14. Woe to them of a double hart, and to Wicked lips, and to the handes that do euill, and to the sinner that goeth on the earth two wayes. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey of our bosome.

Psal. 67. 7. God in his holy place; God that maketh men to inhabit in one maner in a house. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey of our bosome.

Psal. 67. 16. The mountaine of God, a fat mountaine &c. Why suppose you (Sir Humfrey) crudded mountaines? A mountaine in which is hath pleased God to dwell therein; for indeed our Lord will dwell (therin) euen to the end. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.

Psal. 121. 2. Our feete were standing in thy courts o Ierusalem. Ierusalem which is built as a Cittie, whose participation is together in it selfe. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.

• Prouerbs 5. 15. Drinke water of thine owne Cisterne, and the streames of thy Welle &c. Haue them alone: nether let strangers be partakers with thee. And yet (o strang) you will needes nestle in our bosome, and that for no lesse then a thousand yeares together, whether we will or no.

Illy 28. 20. The bed is strained, so that one must needes fall out: and a short mantell cannot couer both. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.

Ieremie 23. 28. The Prophet that hath a dreame, let him tell the dreame: and he that hath my word, let him speake my word truly. What hath she Chasse, so

do *Wish the Wheate*, saith our Lord? Out therfore, Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.

1. Cor. 5. 6. *Your glorying (Sir Humfrey) is not good. Know you not that a litle leuen, corrupteth the whole past?* Out therfore, Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.

1. Cor. 6. 15. *Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Taking therfore the members of Christ, shall I make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. Or know you not, that hee which cleaueth to an harlot, is made one bodie? For they shall be (saith he) two in one flesh: but he that cleaueth to our Lord, is one spirit. Fly (spirituall) fornication. Out therfore, Sir Humfrey, of our bosome.*

Loe Sir Humfrey, you may not sow the field of Gods Church, with sundry feedes: You may plough with an Oxe and an Asse. You may not suppose crudded Mountaines (partly of Chawke, partly of Cheese.) You may not drinke of anothers Cisterne. You may not mingle the Chaffe with the Wheate. The past with the leuen. The members of Christ, with the members of a harlot, and why? The bed is straitned, so that one must fall out. One couerlet, can not couer both you and vs; and why? Because the same sacred word doth farther assure vs, that the *Arke* of Gods Church is but one, one *Kingdome*, one *Cittie*, one *Spouse*, one *Vyneard*, one *Field*, one *Barne*, one *Ship*, one *Net*, and one only *Bodie*. You and we, haue not for these thousand yeares, inhabited together, in one maner in a house, as the scripture expressly saith we must. Your *Ierusalem* hath

hath not had her participation together in her selfe, as scripture expressely saith she ought to haue: and what participation betwixt light and darknes? betwixt God and the Diuel, saith the Apostle? You therefore being the sinner, that treadeth on this sacred earth, *two sundry wayes*, I may safely conclude from the word of God, that your *Safe Way*, is a false, a deceitfull, and a wicked way: not the narrow, but the broad way, the great high way, which, as our Sauour saith, leadeth to hell (Matt. 7. 13.) and alas too too many (thorough your erroneous direction) do enter therein. God forgie you. God open your eyes. God conuert you, and bring you in to the *right way*.

Meane while, who now is so simple as sees not, the danger, crookednesse, and vncertanitie of this deceitfull way, where in to this knight Errant would impath vs? The witnesse hee bringeth, being so few in number. All Papists, not one Protestant. The greater halfe, living since *Luther*. Confusedly and out of order. Not consequenter in a direct line. Not, one in euery seuerall age from Christ to vs (which point I pray the Reader, still to mark and to exact of him particularly:) & yet him selfe so freely confessing, *It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first age, had visible Professors in all Ages* (Not a Profession without Professors: not Professors, without a Profession) how is not all his rotten building overturned? How is not all his fillie deuile, dissolued

meerly into smoke? how may I not rightly call vpon him for his *Butterie booke*, saying? Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, sith Scripture assureth vs. *And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the Ministrie, vnto the building of the body of Christ, vntill we meete all into the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11.*

Parag. V.

Of the Seauen Sacraments.

Sir Humfrey pag. 136.

IT is the third Article of the Roman Creed, that there be truly and properly seauen Sacraments of the new law, instituted by our Lord Iesus Christ, and necessarie to the saluation of mankind. This point of faith was grounded vpon the authoritie of the Councell of Florence, and the Council of Trent: the one did insinuate the number of Seauen Sacraments: the other did expresse decree it for an Article of faith (saith Suarez:) but because the Romanists rely wholly vpon the Trent Council, it will not bee amisse to examine that decree, and therby to obserue with what vnitie and consent, their Profelits haue pursued this Doctrine of faith.

A N S W E R.

Lord, *Sir Humfrey*, how you ouer-lash? Lord, what

what spite, and malice (or grosse ignorance) makes you to speake? For, if it be an *Article of the Roman Creed*, that there be truly and properly *seauen Sacraments of the new law*, instituted by our Lord Iesus Christ, how is this point of faith, grounded vpon the *authoritie of the Councell of Florence and Trent*? And how do the *Romanists rely wholly vpon the Trent Councell*? What is contradiction if this bee not? You say, in one place, that it is an *Article of the Roman Creed*, that these *Seauen Sacraments* were instituted by Iesus Christ: you say in another, that this *Article* take its authority from two *Councils*. You say in another, that the *Romanists* rely wholly vpon the *Trent Councell*, and consequently nether vpon Christ nor the *Councell of Florence*; now sayne would I know which of these three *Sir Humfries*, is to be trusted for the truer man? you tell vs, it *will not be amisse to obserue with what Vnitie and Consent, our proselites haue pursued this doctrine, of faith*; discovering by these words, your desire of an aduersary to fight with all, and yet before you find him, fall so to fight with your selfe, that you make your aduersaries sport to laugh, and moue your freindes to compassion and shame. But let vs proceed.

Sir Humfrey pag. 137.

The *Council of Trent*, hath defined and declared; If any shall say, that all the *seauen Sacraments of the new law*, were not instituted by Christ, or that there are more, or lesse then *seauen*, viz: Baptis-

me, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Vnction, Orders, and Matrimonie; or that any of these is not truly and properly a Sacramēt, let him be accursed. This Trent decree, is so preualent with the Church of Rome, that Bellarmine professeth: This testimonie ought to suffice, if they had no other (*had hee not reason, the Councell assuring, that they were instituted by Iesus Christ?*) And surely it will appeare that other Testimonies are scarce and few (*We shall see that when we come to triall.*) and therefore it may be thought a strange saying, that one testimonie of a late Councel, might suffice for an Article of faith, which by this owne Tener, requires Antiquitie, Vniuersallitie, and Consent. (*and so hath this dout yee not, as wee shall see you ere wee haue done.*) Yet this Cardinall proceeds further, and tell vs, that the Authoritie of this Councell, is so auailable for this point, yea, for all Articles of faith, that if *we should take away the credit of the present (Roman) Church, and present Councell of Trent, the Decrees of all other Councels, may euen Christian faith it selfe, might bee called in question.*

A N S W E R.

Not to bee thought so stranga saying, things well considered. For the Decrees of no Generall Councell, ought to be accounted late. The discussion may be late: the Doctrine it selfe is alwayes *Ancient*. The Cardinall had reason to say, that if we take away the credit of this owne Councell, the Decrees of all other Councels, and Christian faith

faith it selfe may be called in question. For what priviledg I pray, had other precedent Councells, which this had not? What helpes or meanes to find out truth, and to waste error, which this wanted? Others, whē the generall faith of the Church was in question, gathered together their Pastors from all parts, so did this. Others prayed *unanimiter* for the promised assistance of the holie Ghost, so did this. Others made great and diligent search in sacred Scriptures, so did this. Others were seconded with the wisdom, experience and power of the best learned Prelats of all Christendome, so was this. Others heard those venerable Fathers declare what the perpetuall practise of the Church was, so did this. Others both examined, and invited their aduersaries, to say what they were able for themselves, so did this. Others concluded what was to be held for diuine faith, and so did this. Can you tell what any Councell euer did, or could do more? What Bishops, what renowned Prelats assisting presence in all Christendome, had you to assist you besides your selues? nay, had you one only Bishop in all that assemblie? trulie no. What comparison then betwixt your late Parliamentall Conuenticle, and this Councell? Whose decrees (such as they be) notwithstanding they be as late as the Council of Trent, and nothing nere so Ancient as that of Florence, if you take away the credit of one of them, what will be come of the credit of the rest, and the whole corps of your Englishe faith built

and founded vpon the first? Here haue you spun
 ne a faire thrid. Here once againe haue you got
 the wolfe by the eare. Lord what a *quandarie* are
 you in, whether you shall hould him, or let him
 goe!

Sir Humfrey pag. 128.

If (by Christian faith) the Cardinall vnderstand
 the present Roman faith, without dout this say-
 ing is most true; for if we consider their misinter-
 preting the Ancient Creed, and their creating of
 a new, it cannot possibly be defended, but by the
 Roman Church, and the Trent Councell, but if
 he meane the generall, and sauing faith of all true
 beleeuers, I may truly say; this Tenet is a foun-
 dation of Atheisme. For who can say that the
 word of Christ, is not alone sufficient for the
 faith of all beleening Christians? It is the voice of
 the blessed Apostle. *I haue not shunned to declare*
vnro you, all the counsell of God. Acts 20. 27. And
 Bellarmine him selfe is forced to confesse; *That all*
those things are written by the Apostles, which are ne-
cessarie for all men, and which the Apostles preached
generally to all. Besides, how can the faith of Chri-
 tians depend vpon a Church, which is fallen from
 the faith? Or how can a generall beliete of Chri-
 stianitie, rely safely vpon a Councell, that is dis-
 claimed by the greatest part of the (48. *vntrush*)
 Christian world, viz. by England, by France, by
 Germanie &c. But to let passe the Heluetian, the
 Scottish, the German, and the English Churches,
 what wil become of the ancient Church of Rome?

Nay,

Nay what will become of their owne Schoolemen in the latter Ages? Did they all beleue and teache, that there were nether more nor lesse then seauen Sacraments? Did they maintaine, that they were all instituted by Christ? Did they confesse, that they were all truly and properly Sacraments of the new law?

A N S W E R.

Doutles Sir, the Cardinall, by *Christian faith*, vnderstandeth the present Roman faith, & no other. For, would you haue him vnderstand, your present English or Scottish faith? They accord not together: Nay, nether hath *participation together in it selfe*, as hath bene proued against M. Preston pag. 30. and as the Prophet sheweth, it ought to haue; how then would you haue it the Christian faith, or the faith of all Christendome? *Their misinterpreting of the Ancient Creed, and creating of a new*, is no other fault, but becaule they will not interpret after Sir Humfreys new fangled fancie. The Cardinall meanes, by the Roman faith, the generall *sauiug faith of all beleeuers*. What faith euer was, or is generall, if that were not? If you auerre your English, or French, or Scottish faith to be the generall faith of all beleeuers, then may I truly say, this Tenet is a foundation of Atheisme. For how would you haue it *ould*, how would you haue it generall, which hath bene proued euen by the confession of the best learned Protestants, to haue bene *new*, to haue bene *late*, not to haue bene before Luther?

pag.

pag. 32. 37. 40. 41.

2. You demand next ; *Who can truly say, that the Word of Christ, is not alone sufficient for the faith of all beleeuing Christians? None I trow, but an Atheist. Know you any that deny this? If you do not; I will bring you acquainted with one that did. Luther saith, it is a false opinion, that there are foure gospels, allowing only that of S. Iohns, as is to be seene pag. 62. He reputed S. Iames his Epistle, for an Epistle of straw: dare you to deny this? Said he true, or did he lie? Was he an Atheist for so saying, or was he not? Thinke well of the matter, and make your choice.*

3. That of the Apostle Acts 20. and the grant of Bellarmine, *that all those things are written by the Apostles, which are necessarie for all, and which the Apostles preached generally to all, is all true, and comprehended in this, one parcell of their owne penning, he that will not heare the Church, let him be to thee, as a heathen and a Publican. Mat. 18. 17. This includeth all the councill of God. This is that which the Apostles preached generally to all, and left for an Article of our Creed, I beleue the Catholique Church.*

4. I grant the faith of Christians cannot depend vpon a Church, which is fallen from the faith (as your English Church is.) I likewise grant, that a generall beleefe of Christianitie cannot rely safely vpon a Councill, that is disclaymed by the greatest part of the Christian World (as your English Councill is, both by the French and German Church, which
your

your selfe name, besides an number more which I haue named els where.) Nay not one halfe of your English Church it selfe agreeing with you. But if you meane that the Councell of Trent is *disclaymed* by the greatest part of the Christian world, this truly may be *proclaymed*, for one of the greatest and loudest vntruths that euer was could.

Sir Humphrey pag. 141.

If any learned men alieue shall proue, that the seauen Trent Sacraments, were instituted by Christ, and that all the Fathers, or any one Father in the primitiue Church, or any knowen Author for aboue a thousand yeares after Christ, did teach, that there were nether more nor lesse then seauen, truly and properly so called, and to be beleueed of all for an Article of faith (all which is the constant doctrine of the Church of Rome) let the Anathema fall vpon my head.

A N S W E R.

To this I say *first*, I neede returne no other answer then only to retort the same, word for word vpon your selfe: and thus it is. If any learned men alieue shal proue, that the two English Sacraments, were instituted by Christ, and that all the Fathers, or any one Father in the primitiue Church, or any knowen Author for aboue a thousand yeares after Christ, did teach, that there were not Seauen Sacraments, or nether more nor lesse then two, truly and properly so called, and to be beleueed
of

of all for an Article of faith (all which is the constant doctrine of the Church of England) let the Anathema of your English Church fall vpon my head.

I say *secondly*, put the case the question were, of the Number of Gospels. The case so put, repeate once againe euery word of this proposition; and let the Anathema fall on my head, if you, or all the learned men aliuie, be able to proue, that there are nether more nor lesse then foure Gospels, & to be beleueed of all for an Article of faith. Nay *Luther*, the great Grandfir of your new gospell, reiected all for true Gospels, saue only the gospel of *S. Iohn*. Behould therfore with what weake and feeble Arguments, you seeke to ruine and to burie at once, the seauen Sacraments instituted by *Iesus Christ*, and confirmed by this sacred Councell! Behould how still you take *the Wolfe by the eare*! No ancient Father for a thousand yeares and vpwards, euer said, that there were nether more nor lesse then seauen Sacraments, nether more nor lesse then foure Gospels. Ergo there are not seauen Sacraments. Ergo there are not foure Gospels, and the like. Haue you forgot what lately you tould the learned Cardinall? Then suffer me to renue the memory. If you imagine with such friuolous and sillie Arguments to smock at once the number of the Gospels, or the Sacraments, *I may truly say, This Tenet is a foundation of Atheisme*, and directly teaches a *Turke*, how to argue against the Number of our Gospels, and so to infringe the
credit

credit of the one, inst as you do of the other.

I say *thirdly*, we are in possession, time out of minde, and so, to speake properly, it belongeth not to vs to proue; Nay, the question being so important to saluation, how haue not Protestants scripture to put vs downe? We, for our parts, finding one ancient Father to auouch with Scripture, *Marriage* to be a Sacrament; another *Penance*, another *Orders*, and so of the rest, as they had occasion to write now of one, now of another, hould it sufficiēt (with the ful declaration of the Church) to beleue the whole number of seauen. Wherin the better to confirme vs, we haue the confession of sundry of our learned aduersaries, namely of Doctor *Humfrey*, who saith thus. *Quid ad Dionysium dices, qui sex enumerat Sacramenta?* What say you to S. Denis, who numbers vp six Sacraments? *Chemintius* confesseth S. *Cyprian*, to reckon vp fīue. *Caluin* confesseth *Orders* for a Sacrament. Inst. cap. 14. §. 20. Sect. 19. 1. 31. *Bale* in his Pageant of Popes, reprehendeth *Innocentius* the first, for that he affirmed *Annoyling* of the sick to be a Sacrament: as is to be seene Prot. Apologie pag. 126. & 127.

Sir Humfrey pag. 142.

The difference then betwixt the Church of Rome and vs, stands in this; In the two proper Sacraments of *Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper*, we haue the Element and the Institution; in the other fīue, there wanteth either of thele: (49. *vntrush.*)
and

and therefore in a proper sense or meaning, are not to be taken for Sacraments. In Baptisme, the Element is water; In the Lords Supper bread and wine. Baptisme hath the wordes of Institution. *Teach all nations, baptising in the name of the Father, and the Sonne, and the holy Ghost.* The Lords Supper likewise hath the word of Institution; *Do this in remembrance of me.* And therefore we say, these two are properly and truly called Sacraments, because in them the Element is ioyned to the Word, and they take their ordonance from Christ, and be visible signes of an inuisible saving grace. The other five we call them not Sacraments, because they haue not the like Institution.

A N S W E R.

I answer first; The other five you call not Sacraments, therefore they are none. If you pleased but to call them so, this alone would suffice to make them Sacraments: lo the waight, lo the authority of your words! But can you tell me where in your whole Bible, your *two Seales*, are called Sacraments? I pray in your Reply, forget not to direct me to the place, or tell me who imposed that Title on them, and you shall forthwith finde, that he, or she (viz the Church) that called these two by the names of proper Sacraments, tiled others also with the same Title; Touching Scripture, the Scripture which assureth the number of *Two*, assureth also the number of *Seauen*. If no Scripture assure the number of *Seauen*, nether no
 Scrip-

Scripture assureth the number of two. Without Scripture, we haue the Tradition of the Church, and the Authoritie of Generall Councils for the number of Seauen: but both of these we want for the number of only two.

I Answer *secondly*, that as all the Sacraments of the new law, consist of *Things*, and of *Words*, as of *Matter* and *Forme*: so these are found, not only in those *Two*, but also in the other *Five*. In *Confirmation*, is the imposition of the hande, by anointing of the forehead, and the wordes then pronounced. In *Extreame vnction*, the anoyling of the sick, and prayer. The same seemeth of the rest; For in *Penance* is the Act of the penitent, and the wordes of Absolution. In *Orders*, the sacred Instruments and the words of Ordination. In *Matrimonie*, the deliuerie of the parties bodies, and the words which declare the parties consent: and this, saith *S. Paul. Ephes. 5. 32.* is a great Sacrament which *S. Austen* also sundry times calleth by the name of a *Sacrament*, giuing this reason, because it is an inseparable bond betwixt two, which can neuer be dissolued but by death. It is false therefore, that in the other *five* there wanteth either of these.

3. But you will object; here wants the *Commandment* of Christ for the execution of the other Sacraments, I deny this, and therefore answer *thirdly*, that in *holy Orders* (for example) there is both the visible signe; the gift of grace, and the *Commandment*, which is all you can require to constitute a proper Sacrament. The visible signe; is, the Imposi-

tion

fition of handes, which scripture confirmeth Acts 6. 6. These they did set in the presence of the Apostles, and praying, they imposed handes vpon them. The gift of grace, is proued in these wordes. 1. Tim. 4. 14. Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which is giuen thee by prophecie, with the Imposition of the handes of priesthood. The Commandment in these Acts 13. 2. And as they were ministering to our Lord and fasting, the holy Ghost said, separat me Saul and Barnabas, vnto the worke wherso I haue taken them. You are confuted, you are confounded in this one, what shall I neede to doe the like in the rest, especially this being still quite beside the state of our principall question. *Where was your Church before Luther?*

Sir Humfrey pag. 144.

Confirmation was ordained by the Apostles (50. vntrustb) but the Trent Councell confesseth, the Sacraments are ordained by Christ. Penance, and Orders, haue not any outward Element ioyned to the word. And Matrimonie was not ordained by Christ in the new Testament (51. vntrustb) but by God himselfe in Paradise. Besides, the Grants and Seales of Christ (viz. the Sacraments) are the peculiar and proper profession of the Church of Christ. In so much as Turkes and Infidels may haue the benefit of mariage out of the Church, yet cannot haue the benefit of Christs Sacraments, which belōg only to his Church. And lastly, it pallseth our vnderstanding to conceiue, how Mariage should be a Sacrament, when as it contayneth no
grace

6. grace in it selfe, nor power to sanctifie. And how
 and it should be counted an holy thing (as euery Sa-
 of sacrament is tearmed) and yet must be forbidden
 4. to many Christians. Yea to maintaine, that rather
 of fornication (in the Priests case) must be tolerated
 2. before it. What Christian eare can heare with pa-
 ug, tience such grosse incongruities?

A N S W E R.

That Confirmation was ordained by the Apostles, to
 this I answer first; Prooue me this out of Scrip-
 ture, you who appeale to only Scripture. Produce
 any ancient Father, that euer said it, that euer
 thought it, you who sing, that the ancient Fa-
 thers shall bee your *Champions* and your *Seconds*
 (Epist. Ded. pag. 4. 5.) Name me but one only
 amongst them all, and for that one good Fathers
 sake, I will testifie that the Reformed Churches
 are in the right, and submit myne obedien-
 ce with an implicit faith to the English Church.
 And what I say of this Sacrament, I say of Matri-
 monie, which you say *was not ordayned by Christ*.
 If you will forge things out of your owne head,
 not to be found, nether in Scriptures nor in Fa-
 thers, such forged stufte we esteeme lighter then
 any feather.

I say *secondly*, touching *Penance* (for of *Orders*
 I haue spoken already) that it is a Sacrament of
 the new law, instituted by Christ after his Re-
 surrection, when he said to his Apostles (Iohn.
 20. 23.) *receiue yee the holie Ghost, whose sinnes you*

D d

shall

shall forgiue, they are forgiuen, and whose you shall detain, they are detayned. This I proue thus. Three things suffice vnto a Sacrament. 1. The outward *Symbol* instituted by Christ. 2. The *promise* of grace. 3. The *precept* or commandment of Christ for the execution: but these three are found in *Penance*: ergo it is a Sacrament. The outward *Simbole*, is Confession and Absolution instituted by Christ, when hee gaue his Apostles power to to remit sinnes: for the Apostles could not forgiue or retaine others sinnes, vnlesse they knew them by outward Confession: nether could others know their sinnes were forgiuen them of the Apostles, vnlesse they were absolved by an exterior or outward signe. The *promise* of grace is included, in the promise of the forgiuenes of sinnes: for mortall sinnes are not remitted, but by the infusio of iustifying grace. The *Commandment* is also cōprehended: for this wōderfull power were giuen them in vaine, if none were bound to seeke for absolution at their handes: therefore the faithfull are bound to appeare before them in iudgment; for if it were free for them to appeare or not, they could not retayne their sinnes as Christ commandeth, and as appeareth in veniall sinnes, which binde not to Confession, as mortall do.

I say *thirdly*, that if I grant you, that *Turks & Infidels* may haue the benefit of Mariage out of the Church, yet cannot haue the benefit of Christs Sacraments, which belong only to his Church, what will
this

this helpe you? Heretiques are also out of the Church, are they not? By your doctrine then, an heretique Baptized, shall haue the benefit of Baptisme, but not of the Sacrament. And hence it will follow, that you being out of the Church, haue the benefit of Baptisme, and of eating and drinking bread and wine in your Supper, but not the benefit of ether of them, as they are Sacraments. Did euer man make such ropes of sand besids your selfe? But you will say, you are not gone out of the Church of Christ; this therefore must be proued. That you went out of the Church of Rome, that you forsooke the *Romish Sister*, is your owne confession. That she was once the true Church, is your owne. That none out of the Church, can haue the benefit of Christs Sacraments, is likewise your owne: therfore from first to last, you haue no benefit of Christs Sacraments. I leaue your owne knot for your selfe to vntie.

4. That it passeth your vnderstanding to conceiue how mariage should bee a Sacrament, when as it containeth not grace in it selfe nor power to sanctifie, It truly passeth my vnderstanding, how you can read the holie Scriptures, and yet not see that which is so clearly auouched in them. For doth not the Apostle speaking of Mariage, say thus in expresse words. *This is a great Sacrament*? And touching the power it hath to sanctifie, saith hee not as expresse *1. Cor. 7. 14. For the man an Infidel, is sanctified by the faithfull woman: and the woman an Infidel, is sanctified by the faithfull husband; other-*

Wise your children should bee vncleane, but now they are holy. With what Eyes? with what vnderstanding, do you reade the holy Scriptures, who can not vnderstand how this may bee? Verely with those our Sauour decyphereth laying. Eyes they haue and see not. Eares they haue and heare not, harts they haue and vnderstand not.

5. To that which followeth, *How it should be counted an Holy thing (as euery Sacrament is termed) and yet must be forbidden to many Christians?* To this I say fourthly, Priesthood, is a holy thing, and so esteemed amongst you, is it not? Your Communion also, is accounted a holy thing, is it not? Yet forbid you not the one to women and children, and the other to children and vnworthy persons? And how account you them Holy thinges, and yet forbid them to many Christians? Lord how weakely you dispute? Lord how you discover the crookednesse of your *Safe Way*? I say further, that your *Wonder*, is as weake as this, to wonder how a thing should be forbidden him, which hath by vow to God voluntarily forbid the thing vnto him selfe? So that you wonder, one will not haue that which him selfe will not haue? Is not this a goodly wonder? Sir, you seeke in euery thing to *deceiue*, for this holy thing is not forbidden to any Christian, no nor to a Priest, as hee is a Christian, but to a Priest, as he is a voluntarie vowed virgin to our Lord; and as such a Christian, a vowed Christian, he is forbid, not only by men, but by God himselfe

himselfe, not to break his vow, saying. If any man make a vow to our Lord, or bind him selfe by an oath, hee shall not make his word frustrat, but all that hee hath promised, he shall fulfil. (Numb. 30. 3.) Further Confirmed by the Royall Prophet saying. *Vowe yee, and render to our Lord your God.* Psal. 75. 120. But more to purpose is that of Deut. 23. 21. *When thou hast vowed a vow to the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it, because our Lord thy God will require it: and if thou delay, it shall be reputed to thee for sinne. If thou wilt not promise, thou shalt be without sinne; but that which is once gone out of thy lips, thou shalt obserue, and shalt doe as thou hast promised to our Lord thy God, and hast spoken with thy proper will and thine owne mouth.* And thus at last, you wonder, not at vs alone, but at God him selfe (which seemes vnto vs a strang wonder) *How a Holie thinge must be forbidden?* And you tell him as well as vs, *What Christian eare can here with patience such grosse incōgruities?* I leaue God and you therefore, to grapple together (sith needes you will wrangle with him, and lay such grosse incongruities to his charge:) let him answer for him selfe; meane while I shall hartely pray him, to pacifie your impatient eare, and so proceed to your authorities.

Sir Humfrey pag. 145. 146.

If therefore a generall Councell shall accurse, not only those that deny the number, but, *si quis dixerit: If any shall say there are ether,*

more or lesse then seauen,) then woe bee to all the Ancient Fathers. For if they be conuenced before the Councell, they will all stande guilty of this curse. Accursed be *Ambrose*, and *Austen*, and *Chrysostom*, and *Bede*, for they taught that out of the side of Christ, came the two Sacraments of the Church Blood and water : but that there were nether more nor lesse then seauen, they taught not, they beleueed not.

A N S W E R.

1. This is such weake and sorry stuffe, as a very childe may retort vpon your selfe, a very child discover, you seeke to *deceiue*. For shew me, name me that Ancient Father, bee it *S. Ambrose*, *S. Austen*, or any other, that euer taught, or euer beleueed, that there were nether more nor lesse then only two? They taught there were two: ergo they taught there were no more? How for Gods sake followes this? Eye for shame of such fraud. Eye for shame of such euident foisting. What *Christian eares* (to vse your owne words) can endure to beare such grosse incongruities? But to bee brief.

2. That of *S. Isidore* (a Father so Ancient) accounting three, I wonder you blush not to recount, who only acknowledg the number of two, and deny *Confirmation*, which hee confest, for a Sacrament? Was he a Protestant?

3. The like I do at that of *Alexander de Hales*, whom your selfe confesse held four properly said
to be

to be Sacraments? How could he possibly be a Protestant?

4. The like I do of that ancient Author supposed for *Cyprian*, who by your owne confession, confessed five. Was he a Protestant?

5. The like I do of *Durand*, who graunted Six, properly so called: and yet forsooth hee was a Protestant?

6. That of *Besbarion* (pag. 147.) I haue not, to know whether you alleadg him true or false. Besides, to say there are but two plainly in the *gospell*, is not to deny the others are not there, though more obscurely: or though they bee not in the *Gospell*, yet that therefore they are no where else, for it sufficeth they be found in the Traditione doctrine of the Church.

7. That of *Bellarmino* pag. 148. saying, *It is sufficient that the Fathers in diuers places, and diuers Fathers of the same age in some places, make mention, of these seauen Sacraments*, what say you to this? Forsooth you wonder, why the Roman Church should presume, to impose the peremptorie number of Seauen, with a curse vpon all them that belecue them not.

A N S W E R.

Sir, I put a case vnto your selfe. Certaine heretiques arise amongst you that deny one of your two Sacraments. Their reason is, because no Scripture expressly nameth the number of two, nor no Ancient Father saith, that there is neither more nor lesse. He denyeth likewise some of the booke

kes which your selfe account for Canonically, and numbred vp to *Sixtie six*, for the selfe same reason as aforesaid. He wonders at you, as you do at vs, *Why the English Church should presume to impose the peremptorie number of two in the one, and Sixtie six in the other*, with a curse vpon all them that beleeeue them not. What say you now vnto these men? What order will you take to stop their mouths, and suppress the heretiques? Will you suffer them to deny the *Number*? Will you oblige them by your Churches lawes to beleeeue the *Number*? Tell vs I pray, what you will do in such a case, *that the world may see it is no hard thing for a meane lay man to vntye such easie knots: else the world will wonder to see you fail so at war with your owne witts, and so often to take the wolfe by the eare, with such euident peril both to your owne, and your English Mothers reputation.* But to come to your other Authorities.

Sir Humfrey pag. 150.

S. Ambrose in his Treatise of the Sacraments diuided into six bookes, makes no mention but of two.

A N S W E R.

Well, what inferre you therupon? He makes no mention but only of two: ergo there is but only two? Say he had employed those six bookes only to write of one of them (as many a learned man hath done the like :) how doth it follow *S. Ambrose* wrote six whole bookes of one Sacrament,

ment, mentioning no more but one. Ergo there is but only one. Lord how palpably you seeke to deceiue!

Sir Humfrey pag. 151. 152.

S. Austen tell vs. Our Lord, and his Apostles, haue deliuered vnto vs a few Sacraments in stead of many &c. And in another place lastly cōcludeth them both in the number of two.

A N S W E R.

To this I say *first*, that seauen may be said to be a few Sacraments, in comparison of many. I say *secondly*, that still you seeke to deceiue; for *S. Austen* speaking there but of two, what maruell is it, that he concluded two, in the number of two? Who can but pittie so poore a disputant? I say *thirdly*, lest you should thinke by this deceit, to make the Reader beleue that *S. Austen* held no more but two, hearken what him selfe saith else where (tom. 8. in psal. 103. concione 1. ante med.) *Behould the gifts of the Church, the gift of the Sacraments, in Baptisme, in the Eucharist, in the other holy Sacraments, what a gift it is?* Now tell me I pray, doth *S. Austen* here conclude them both in the number of two, or doth this passage make you blush? If not, take yet another much more plainer, and more to purpose. *The Sacrament of Chrisme in the kind of visible signes, is sacred euen as Baptisme it selfe* (tom. 7. cont. lit. Peril. l. 3. c. 104. circa med.) Lo, he calls *Chrisme* expressly by the name of a Sacrament, and comparatiuely, compares it for sanctitie

sanctitie vnto Baptisme, ergo he held it for a proper Sacrament. And rom. 7. cont. epist. Parmen. lib. 2. c. 13. ante med. he compareth the Sacrament of Orders also with that of Baptisme, saying. *If both be Sacraments, Which none doubteth of &c.* I would giue a penny I were standing by you, to see in what a dumpe these two sayings of *S. Austen* haue striken you, who so peremptorily deny more Sacraments then two. How soeuer, I haue already found you *seure* Sacraments out of him, and could as easily finde the other *three*: but if he held *seure*, and you but *two*, how I pray will you proue *S. Austen* to be a Protestant?

4. The three authorities which next follow pag. 52. & 53. of *Chrysostome*, *Theophilact*, and *Paschasius* Abbot, are not to purpole. That the Church was first framed of those two Sacraments, we deny not. That she is framed only of them, this is that which we deny, and you must proue, and ought to proue only out of the written word: But where you say of *Paschasius* Abbot; *And although in the latter editions, the Word (Chrisme) is crept in betwixt Baptisme and the Lords Supper &c.* I vrge you to name that other former edition wherein it was wanting, or else pardon me if I make vp this for the (52. *vntruth*) crept in here, to discredit the same Author, which yet your selfe would seeme to make vse of: and whom, in stying by the name of an Abbot (being so Ancient as he was) you violate, and do not vindicat your English Mothers cause, who hath cassied both Abbots and Monks out of

Sir Humfrey pag. 155.

Poligamy; or mariage of many wiues S. Austen calls a Sacrament, as signifying the multitude of the Gentills that should be subiect to God. Againe, he tearmeth the signe of the Crosse, Exorcisme, Holy bread, given to the Catechumenists (no vices in faith) by the names of Sacraments. Pope Alexander the first, describerh Holy Water, as a Sacrament. &c.

A N S W E R.

1. You astonish me, *Sir Humfrey*, to see how palpably you strike your selfe, yea and wound your English Mothers cause, & yet nether she, nor you feele it, nor your deceiued Readers, ōce perceiue it. You ingeniously cōfesse in this place, that the signe of the Crosse, *Exorcisme, Holy bread, Holy Water*, and the like, to be at all, *no vices in faith*, hearken now what your English Mother saith, and then vindicat her cause, and your owne reputation, if you be able.

2. Whosoever thorough his priuat iudgment willingly and purposely, doth openly breake the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by comon authority, ought to be rebuked openly, that others may feare to do the like, as he that offendeth against the comon order of the Church, hurteth the authoritie of the Magistrat, and woundeth the conscience of the weake. Thus your English Mother, Article

14. touching ecclesiasticall Traditions . Now if these three last Ceremonies were so ancient as from *S. Austen* and *Pope Alexander*: if as your selfe confesse, *they be no vices in faith*: if as your English another confesseth , *they be not repugnant to the Word of God* , how are not both you and she to be rebuked openly for reiecting such ancient Traditions ? How offend you not against the common order of the Church ? Hurt the authoritie of the Magistrat, & wound the conscience of the weake ? Who now turnes the neckes of the Fathers cleane about , so to wrest them to their owne sides , but *Sir Humfrey* ? Who still takes the Wolfe by the eare, but *Sir Humfrey* ? Who beates him selfe with his owne rodde ? Who more opposeth , who more disputeth against him selfe and the English Sister ? And who more propugneth the cause of the Romish Sister, then doth *Sir Humfrey* ?

3. From the Ancient Fathers, you come to the later schoolemen, of three or foure hundred yeares standing, picking a peece out of one, and snatching a litle shred from another, to helpe your selfe with all at a point of extremitie : all whom I will briefly wind vp in one, as not enriched with them, to see how faithfully you cite them . But principally, because it is quite from the state of the present question ; *Where was your Church before Luther* ? And therefore, touching all those that you haue cited from *Alexander of Hales* pag. 158. (whom I greatly suspect you haue corrupted) to *S. Bonaventure* pag. 165, I make vnto you this demãd. Was
Alexan-

Alexander of Hales a Protestant? Was *Cardinall Hugo of S. Victor* a Protestant? Was *Cardinall Bellarmine* a Protestant? Was *Suarez* the Iesuit a Protestant? Was *Dominicus à Soto* a Protestant? Was *Cardinall Caietan* a Protestant? Was *Canus* a Protestant? Was *Vasquez* the Iesuit a Protestant? Was *S. Thomas of Aquin* (a Dominican Friar) a Protestant? Was the Patriarch of *Venice* a Protestant? Was *S. Bonauenture* (a begging Friar of *S. Francis* order, and after exalted to be a *Cardinall*) a Protestant? Did they not all say Masse? Did they not all adhere to the Pope and Church of Rome? Did they not all beleue a Purgatory, worship Images, pray to Saints, and hould all the rest of our Romish ragges? How were they then the visible Protestant professors, which according to the Iesuits Challenge you promise to shew? That truly Reformed English Sister, who because as you tell vs pag. 45, she would not practise spirituall fornication with her Sister of Rome, but keepe her first loue, and continue her Ancient birth-right from the time of the Apostles to the dayes of Luther, might better iustifie her separation from her, then the retayning of fellowship with her lewdnesse. Now, you had a Church, you had visible Professors separate from these (according to your owne saying) or you had not. You can likewise name them to vs, as you do these, or you can not. If you had, then name them to vs; let these alone. If you had not, then what tell you vs of your Reformed Sisters separation? Then what notorious cosonation, euident

dent deception, and illuſion, is this of yours? Lord that any vnderſtanding man, ſhould wrong ſo much his owne witts! Lord that any true and faithfull beleeuers, ſhould euer be borne away with ſuch an emptie buzze! *Lord haue mercy vpon vs, Chriſt haue mercy vpon vs, Lord haue mercy vpon vs,* to ſee with what poore ſhifts learned Proteſtants ſeek to deceiue, and to ſee with what poore ſtuffe vnlearned Proteſtants ſuffer them ſelues to be deluded! But to make an end of this Paragraph, and winde out at laſt of this crooked way: you cloſe vp this diſcourſe thus.

Sir Humfrey pag. 168.

If we conſider therefore this Article of the Roman faith, both as it wants prooffe of the Ancient Fathers, and as it is declined, and not diſcuſſed by the later Schoolemen, in the Negative, our aduerſaries ſhall haue little cauſe to deny the viſibilitie of our Church, for our acknowledging Two, and leſſe reaſon to bragge of their markes of Antiquitie and Vniuerſalitie in the faith of their Seauen. Touching our Two, they were anciently beleeued, and are receiued by them and vs, for true and proper Sacraments of the Church (53. *vntruth.*) Touching Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimonie, they are receiued by the Church of Rome and vs, but with this difference, they are decreed by them for true and proper Sacraments, they are receiued and allowed by vs, for Rites and Ordonances in our Church, (54. *vntruth.*)

A N S W E R.

Besides that it were worth the knowing why you admit these *four*, and exclude *Extream Vnction*, which is the *fift*, you heape vntruths, Sir *Humfrey*, one in the neck of another intollerably. All thole you haue lately named, as, *Alexander of Hales*, Cardinall *Hugo*, Cardinall *Bellarmino*, Cardinall *Bonauenture* and the rest, were they the visible Professors of your Reformed Church? Are there any *Iesuits*? Are there any *Cardinals*, in any of your Reformed Churches? Doe you not a litle before bring them in, as egregiously disagreeing, and dissenting amongst themselves? Will you then agree with them, who agree not with themselves? Will you conspire with them, will you consent with them, who so dissent amongst them selues? Nay will you inbreast them in the *bosome* of your Church, or inbreast your selues in their *bosome*, who *ride their horses vp to the bridles in the blood of your Saints*? Who euer heard of such a Chymera? What man in his right wits, will suffer him selfe to be made so very a mome, as to be made a *member*, of so memberlesse a Church? *Gloriosa dicta sunt de te ciuitas Dei!* Wonderfull things are said of thee, O thou Church of Protestants! Our Lord out of *Sion* blese thee, that thou maist see the good things of *Ierusalem* all the dayes of thy life: and that thou maist see thy *childrens children*, and shewing them vnto the Papists, maist stop their mouths, so to procure an euerlasting, *peace vpo Israel*. ps. 127.

This Sir *Humfrey*, vntill you do, neuer will their
mouths

mouths be stopped, nor Protestants consciences be euer satisfied, but still will crie out vnto you; Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, sith you who ar a child of Truth, tell vs. It is an vndoubted Truth and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible Professors in al Ages. *Epist. Ded. pag. 3.* Sith Truth it selfe also tells vs. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the Worke of the Ministrie, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill we meete all into the vnitie of faith, to wit, vnto the end of the world. Note well, I pray you, these effectuall wordes; and so often repeated by me, for they are the very Touchstone of this triall, and keepe vs both vnto our Text. He speaketh, he insisteth still vpon their Persons, as 1. *Apostles*, not their Apostolical writings only. 2. *Prophets*, not their Prophecies only, abstracting from the persons of the Prophets. 3. *Euangelists*, or Gospellers, not their Gospells only. 4. *Pastors* or Feeders, not the word only where with they feede. 5. *Doctors*, not their Doctrine only, abstracting from the Doctors them selues: but both the Gospellers, and their Gospel, both the Doctors, and their Doctrine: in *Concreto*, not in *Abstracto*, as the Prince of Philosophers speaketh. Doe this, giue vs this, which the word so plainly tells you that he gaue. Deferre no longer: dally no longer: bringe vs once out of this crooked, into a Secure and Safe Way;
winde

winde vs once out of this bushie wood, whose
Brambles and Briars, do nothing else but scratch
and prick both our face and fingers, and set vs in
that plaine and perfect path, that we may once
finde; Where was your Church before Luther.

Parag. VI.

Communion in both kinds.

Sir Humfrey pag. 171.

IT is the sixt Article of the Roman Creed: I
I confesse, that vnder one kinde onely, all, and
whole Christ, and the true Sacrament is receiued.
This halfe Communion is created, or declared
for an Article of faith, and this Article of faith is
lately descended from the Councell of Constan-
ce 1400. yeares after Christ; In which Coun-
cell it was declared, that Christ did institute in both
kinds, and the primitive Church did continue it so
the faithfull in both kinds. But for waighrie rea-
sons (as they tearme them) though contrarie (55.
vntrust) to Christs institution and the practise of
all Antiquitie (56. vntrust) they decreed a halfe
Communion with this caution; That if any should
obstinately maintaine, that it was vnlawfull, or erro-
neous to receiue in one kinde, he ought to be pun-
ished, and driuen out as an hereticke. So that by this
Decree, with a (Non obstante) in the Canon (that is)
notwithstanding Christ did institute in both kinds,

E c

and

and the primitive Church receive it so; I say, from the time of that Councell (as it were in despite of God and man) the maintayning of the whole Cōmunion, that is, in both kinds, was a diudged heresie.

A N S W E R.

I neede to say litle to this point, which you haue brought in, I can not tell, how oft before, and hath bene briefly touched in sundry places: but we must needes dance after your pipe, how dissonant soeuer the musick be. Perhaps you haue whetted this weapon a new, and will try if it will cut better then it did before. We are content, assuring our selues, you beate at that Truth which will soone blunt it, for hard it is with so weake a weapon to hew a Rock, as you shall alwayes finde the faith of the Catholicke Roman Church to be. I will therefore to giue you ample scope to fetch your blow, back, and second this assertion 1. From the *Figures* of the old Testament. 2. From *Proofoes* of the new. 3. From *Miracles*. 4. From *Pra-ctise* of the primitive Church, and ancient Fathers. 5. From the cōfessiō of our very *Aduersaries*. 6. And lastly, with sundry arguments drawen from the rule of Reason, so to giue full satisfaction to my Reader.

Touching the old Testament I say first, That this our doctrine is confirmed from sundry cleare and eident *Figures*, prefiguring our present practise; as, the eating of the fruit of the tree of life in the garden of Paradise Gen. 2. The children of
 Israels

Israels *eating* of the Paschall Lamb. *Exod. 12.* Their *eating* of the sacred Manna, made in heauen, by the handes of Angels. *Exod. 16.* (no speech of drinking.) King Dauids *eating* of the loaues of *Proposition*, which was not lawfull to eate, but for the Priests alone. *1. Reg. 21. 6.* Can you deny that these were figures of the Blessed Sacrament? Can you deny, that this most Blessed Sacrament, is the *tree of life*, planted by our Lord in the garden of his Church? Can you deny it to be the true *Paschall Lambe*, which preserues vs from the destroying plague? Can you deny it to be the heauenly *Manna*, where with the faithfull are fed in the wilderness of this world? Can you deny it to be the loafe of *Proposition*, which refresheth the soule of him that is Hungrie? If you cannot deny this, these being figures in only *eating*, then *eating* only, or receiuing in one kind alone, was prefigured in the old law: then is this our practise confirmed from the authoritie of the old Testament. Then must you needes confesse that Protestants in their receiuing, haue nothing which doth to truly resemble these ancient figures, especially this fact of *Dauids*, as Catholiques haue; For we cannot doe all in this kind, that our Priests can do, not so you: therefore, our practise more resembleth sundry examples of the old Testament, then yours doth. And now to fetch the like from the sacred fountaine of the new, and first from *figures*, as the former.

I say, *secondly*, that two stupendious miracles, one of *five*, another of *seauen* loaues of bread wher-

with our Sauour fed so many thousand soules, (Marc. 6. Marc. 8. Ioh. 6.) (not making any miraculous drinke) was a figure of the blessed Sacrament to be receiued of the common people in one kind only; And that our Sauour in that one Chapter no lesse then 10. or 12. senerall times, attributeth euerlasting life to eating alone, saying, verse 27. *Worke not the meate that perisheth, but that endureth to life euerlasting.* verse 32. *My Father giueth you the true bread from heauen.* verse 32. *The bread of God it is that descendeth from heauen, and giueth life to the World.* verse 35. *I am the bread of life.* verse 50. *This is the bread that descendeth from heauen, that if any man eate of it, he die not.* verse 51. *I am the liuing bread that came downe from heauen, if any man eate of this bread, he shall lue for euer.* verse *ibid.* *The bread which I will giue, is my flesh for the life of the World.* verse 57. *He that eateth me, the same also shall lue by me.* verse 58. *This is the bread that came downe from heauen, not as your Fathers did eate Manna and died.* verse *ibid.* *He that eateth this bread, shall lue for euer, besides many more which I omit: shew me now, that drinking is so often recommended vnto vs, as eating is? That wine, or blood, is so often inculcated, as is bread, flesh, and the eating of his blessed body. If you cannot do this, then this sentence, he that eateth this bread shall lue for euer, being absolutely the very last wordes wherewith our Sauour closeth vp his whole discourse about Sacramentall receiuing, it followes inuincibly against your sleeuelesse suppositiō of a halfe Com-*

munion, that to receiue the Sacramentall bread alone, may suffice. But to giue you some further proofes forth of the new.

I say *thirdly*, Luc. 24. 30. These words of holy Scripture. *Hee tooke bread and blessed, and brake, and did reach to them; S. Austen, Paulinus, Beda, and other ancients, vnderstand to bee ment of the B. Sacrament, as being the very same with those of S. Mathew. He tooke bread, blessed, and brake, and gaue vnto them.* Which supposed, then haue we an euident example and warrant, not only from the expresse words, but also from the *fact* and *practise* of Christ him selfe, administering the Sacrament vnder one kinde only, and that according to the minde of three so famous and venerable Fathers. The like wee read Acts 2. 42. *And they were perseuering in the Doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread* (not a word at all of any wine) The very like wee read Acts 20. 7. *And in the first of the Sabbath, when we were assembled to break bread: which argueth, not only that Christ, but that euen the Apostles them selues, somtimes communicated the primitiue Christians vnder one kind.* And 1. Cor. 10. 18. *S. Paul saith. He that eateth the hostes, is partaker of the Altar. He that eateth,* saith hee; plainly insinuating, that it sufficeth to eate only of one kind, to be partaker of the whole.

Thus haue wee proued this point, not only from the figures of the *old* Testament, or probable collections of the *new*, but from the expresse

both wordes and practise of Christ him selfe. Wherto I add further, that where as only four of the Apostles write expressly of our Lords Supper, two of them (to wit, *S. Luke* and *S. Paul*) who register this fact more particularly than the others doe, say, that Iesus *tooke bread*, and *gaue it* them saying, *this is my body*, *do this* for a remembrance of me; not touching, not giving, not consecrating, nor saying the like of the Chalice, till *after supper* as both of them specifie particularly. This being so, this being as cleare as the very Sunne, and a notable space of time passing betwixt the beginning and ending of this Supper, wherein Twelve feueral persons were to receiue the blessed bread, so long before they receiued the cup, it followes irrefragably, that our Saviour communicated all the twelue vnder one kind, yea, and further bid them do that which he had done, when as yet him selfe had done nothing but to one alone. Ergo from first to last, euē from the fact of our Saviour him selfe, one kind alone may be giuen. From testimonies taken both from the old and *new Testamēt*, I wil next turne to sacred *Miracles*, which being wrought by God, must needs be of equall authoritie with his written word.

To ratifie this by the prooffe of Miracles, I say *first*, that the renowned Father and Martyr *S. Cyprian* de lapsis ferm. 5. recounteth a stupendious miracle wrought by the B. Sacrament vnder one kind alone, which clearly conuinceth that Christ is whole and perfect vnder one species alone, as well

well as vnder both. His words are these. *Cum quadam arcam suam &c.* When a certaine Woman did attempt with vnworthy hands to open her Coffer, in which was the holie thing of our Lord, there arose thence a fire, and so feared her, that she durst not touch it. Thus S. Cyprian. Parliament of Christ. lib. 1. cap. 24. pag. 57. mentioning four miracles together, which this ancient Father affirmeth God had wrought about this diuine and dreadfull Sacrament.

Secondly, the selfe same author, in the selfe same place, recounteth of another Miracle out of S. Ambrose, wrought by the B. Sacrament vnder one species alone, wherby the life of *Satyrus*, S. Ambrose brother (hanging the same about his neck) was saued from Shipwrack.

Thirdly, hee recounteth two other Miracles, of the same kinde out of *Amphilochius*, and other ancient Fathers, which hapned within the compasse of the first 400. yeares lib. 2. cap. 42. wrought by ether of the Species a part.

Fourthly of an vnbeleeuing woman, who going to Church, and receiuing only vnder one kind, to content her husband, the holy Sacrament was turned into a stone betwixt her teeth. Which she seeing being afrighted, was conuerted. *Psalm. of Christ lib. 2. cap. 68. fine.* Besides those mentioned of the *Donarists*, who threw the B. Sacrament to the Dogges, which turning vpon their masters, tore them in two. And of an heretick in our contrie, wherof *Thomas Waldenses* maketh mencion,

as wherat him selfe was present, and hapned in in *S. Pauls* in London, where the Bishop of Canturburie, willing an heretike to adore the Sacramēt, he refusing so to doe, and saying he would rather adore a Spider, an ougly Spider came downe from the top of the Church, and without the helpe of others; had entred into the hereticks mouth. tom. 2. cap. 63.

5. Now, *Sir Humfrey* (not to lay before you more of later time) you, who are so great and pretended a patron of Antiquitie, you who will not haue the necks of the holie Fathers, to bee turned about to wrest them to mens priuat purpose, what say you to these so true, so ancient, and so authentickall testimonies? You will not with a slight skorne, reiect these *miraculously* imagine, that some Papists inuented them to confirme the verie reall presence, and of our *halfe* Communion please to call it? For they being in the compasse of 400. yeares were too great a wickednesse, to thinke inuentions to haue bene deuiled in so primitiue times (and when, as you Protestants) to bouldter vp the errors of the Papists. You must of fine force to either confesse these related *Miracles* to bee true, and consequently grant Christ to be totallie present vnder one Species alone, or your selfe commit that haynous cryme, which you would seeme to lay to others mens charge, of turning the necks of the

of the Fathers quite about, so to wrest them to your owne side. I haue next promised to proue the same from the testimonies of the ancient Fathers.

To proue this point from the testimonie of Antiquitie, besides what I haue already said touching this point, I am first to put you in minde, that where you tell vs, *this article of faith is lately descended from the Councell of Constance, 1400. yeares after Christ, First, Alexander of Hales, who liued two yeares before the Councell of Constance, faith, that almost every where, lay-men receiued vnder the sole forme of bread.*

Secondly, venerable Bede our owne contryman (and a Protestant by M. Prestons account of 800. yeares standing) doth signifie, that in the Church of England, euer since her first conuersion vnder Gregorie our Apostle, the laitie vsed communion vnder one kind. Which could neuer haue come into the Church (much lesse haue continued long therein) without being noted for an heresie. Had not the Church euer held Communion vnder one, or both kindes, as a thing of innocence; as the author of the *Reioynder to Dr. Heynes Reply* pag. 337. hath learnedly noted: you may if you please, turne to him to see the Authorities. Yea it is cleare euen from most ancient times, it was the custome in the Churches of certaine prouinces, that the faithfull receiued only vnder one kind, as *S. Thomas* testifyeth, *part. 3. q. 80. art. 12.* And the same doth Cardinal *Hosius* of Polonia witnesse, that from the time of their conuersion

as wherat him selfe was present, and hapned in in *S. Pauls* in London, where the Bishop of Canturburie, willing an heretike to adore the Sacramēt, he refusing so to doe, and saying he would rather adore a Spider, an ougly Spider came downe from the top of the Church, and without the helpe of others; had entred into the hereticks mouth. tom. 2. cap. 63.

5. Now, *Sir Humfrey* (not to lay before you more of later time) you, who are so great and pretended a patron of Antiquitie, you who will not haue the necks of the holie Fathers, to bee turned about to wrest them to mens priuat purpose, what say you to these so true, so ancient, and so authentically testimonies? You will not I hope with a slight skorne, reiect these *miracles*, or slanderously imagine, that some Papist craftily inuented them to confirme the veritie of Christs reall presence, and of our *halse Communion*, as you please to call it? For they being wrought with in the compasse of 400. yeares after Christ, it were too great a wickednesse, to thinke any vaine inuentions to haue bene deuiled in those pure & primitiue times (and when, as you opine, all were Protestants) to bouldster vp the errors or fancies of the Papists. You must of fine force therefore, ether confesse these related *Miracles* to bee true, and consequently grant Christ to be totallie present vnder one Species alone, or your selfe commit that haynous cryme, which you would seeme to lay to others mēs charge, of turning the necks
of the

of the Fathers quite about, so to wrest them to your owne side. I haue next promised to proue the lame from the testimonies of the ancient Fathers.

To proue this point from the testimonie of Antiquitie, besides what I haue already said touching this point, I am first to put you in minde, that where you tell vs, *this article of faith is lately descended from the Councell of Constance, 1400. yeares after Christ, First, Alexander of Hales, who liued two yeares before the Councell of Constance, faith, that almost every where, lay-men receiued vnder the sole forme of bread.*

Secondly, venerable Bede our owne contryman (and a Protestant by M. Pressons account of 800. yeares standing) doth signifie, that in the Church of England, euer since her first conuersion vnder S. Gregorie our Apostle, the laitie vsed communion vnder one kind. Which could neuer haue entred into the Church (much lesse haue continued so long therein) without being noted for an heresie, had not the Church euer held Communion vnder one, or both kindes, as a thing of indifferencie; as the author of the *Reioynder to D. Whites Reply* pag. 337. hath learnedly noted: you may if you pleate, turne to him to see the Authorities. Yea it is cleare euen from most ancient times, it was the custome in the Churches of certaine prouinces, that the faithful receiued only vnder one kind, as S. Thomas testifieth, *part. 3. q. 80. art. 12.* And the same doth Cardinal Hosius of Polonia witnesse, that from the time of their conuersion

version to the faith of Christ, it is not read, that they received otherwise then vnder one only species, vnlesse the Priests in the holy Masse. *Dialogo de veraq; specie.*

Thirdly, to ascend higher, and to proue this truth from authorities of more Antiquitie. It is a principle of our faith, that in the B. Sacrament, after Consecration, vnder the forme of bread, to be containd the very body of Christ, and vnder the forme of wine, his very blood. Not in the one, blood without the body: not in the other, the body without, or wanting blood. Our reason is, because Christ, as the scripture saith, *being risen from the dead, now dyeth no more*: death can no more haue dominion ouer him. For, if the body were with out the blood, it could not be a liuing bodie, nay death should bee in the body of Christ the second time, which were blasphemie to imagine. Wherefore, it is cleare that the bodie of Christ being in the blessed Sacrament, is a true body, and consequently a body with blood, yea, a liuing and a perfect body: lets see now if the holie Fathers of highest standing, vnderstood not this sacred truth in our very lence. *S. Cyprian* who liued in third Age after Christ, saith thus: *Panis iste communis &c.* This comon bread, changed into the flesh and blood of our Lord, teacheth vs, that it is not flesh alone, but that it is both flesh and blood. *Cyp. de coena Domini.* Thus *S. Cyprian* of the bread; see now what *S. Irenaeus*, elder then hee, saith likewise of the blood. *Calicem qui est creatu-*

*ea, suum corpus confirmauit. Hee auerred the Cup, which is a creature, to be his body. Loe Sir Humfrey, one sayeth, the bread is changed into his blood: the other saith, blood is changed into his body. If vnder the species of bread, bee (according to S. Cyp.) our Lords blood: and vnder the species of wine (according to S. Ireneus) our Lords body, then it necessarie followes, that he that receiues the bread alone, receiues also the blood of our Lord: and he that receiueth the wine alone, his pretious body. Then both body and blood, are vnder the bread. Then both body and blood, are vnder the wine. Then is Chrst wholie in the one, and wholie in the other, without diminution. Which being so, whats become now Sir Humfrey, of your Chymericall *halse-Communion*. Whether, for Gods sake, is it fled? In to what poore nooke or corner is it crept? Or if you be not content with these testimonies, I remit you for more examples of Antiquitie in this kinde, to M. Doctor Kellisons Reply to M. Sutcliffe pag. 190. To M. Doctor Hardings answer to M. Iewells Challenge pag. 63. To his Reioynder against the same Iewell pag. 165. 169. and so I passe to the *fift*, which is, to proue this point from the confession of our aduersaries.*

Fist, That our very aduersaries witnesse the indifferencie of this doctrine on our side, I appeale *Fist*, to the iudgment of Melancthon, who putteth downe the state of the question with this temperat pen. That, as to eate, or not to eate
 swines

swines flesh, is placed in our power, and a thing indifferent: so I (saith he) *iudge of the Eucharist, that they sinne not, who knowing and beleuing this libertie, do vse ether part of the signes: thus Melancthon a prime Protestant in 2. edit Comm. impref. Argent anno 1525. fol. 78.*

Secondly, Hospinian another learned Protestant, alleadgeth *Luther*, affirming it is not needfull to giue both kindes, but that one alone doth suffice. The Church hath power of ordayning only one, and the people ought to be content therewith, if it be ordayned by the Church. Thus the Author of the *Reioynder to Doctor Whites* reply pag. 336. from whence I tooke these three prealleged testimonies.

Thirdly, The first Statute made in a Parliament, held in the first yeare of the raigne of K. Edward the sixt, approueth Communion vnder one kind, in time of necessitie, neuer deeming they did ought in despight of God and man, as you censure vs to do. For which see the Grounds of the old and new Religion, part. 2. pag. 41.

Fourthly, but heare, I pray, what Martin Luther, that Father of light, saith of this matter, hee who first tooke the triple Crowne off from the Popes head, and tooke downe the bellies of the fat and sturdie friars. They (saith this second Elias) sinne not against Christ, who vse one kinde, seeing Christ doth not command to vse both, but hath left it to the Will of euery one. Reioynder to D. Whites Reply pag. 336. And how is it possible, that this light of his
and

and yours, can stand together in one lantern?

Fifthly, I will giue you one more out of *Martin Luther*, & so leaue you for testimonies taken from our Aduersaries: hee then, in a booke which hee wrote to the *Bohemians*, saith thus. *Because indeed it were good to vse both kinde, and Christ hath commanded nothing in this case as necessarie, it were better to follow peace and vnitie, then to contend vpon the formes and kinde of receiuing the Sacrament.* Confutation of *M. Iewells Sermon by M. Rastal* pag. 128, lo *Sir Humfrey* how directly, and in how expresse tearmes, you giue that man of God your great Grandfather *Martin Luther*, the flat lye! he saith in plaine tearmes, that *Christ* hath commaded nothing in this case as necessary: you tell him, and vs in plaine tearmes (yea sundry times) that this was decreed contrarie to *Christs precept*, and, as it were in despight of God and man. Buckle you and he about the businesse.

Sixthly; Now for a close to this discourse, of prouing my purpose from the confession of Opponents, suppose this *Father of light*, *Martin Luther*, *M. Melancthon*, *Hospinian*, and the Parliament in *K. Edwards* time, had bene as ancient as *S. Cyprian*, *S. Irenaeus*, and other Ancients named by me, and wee as inuisible all the while to you, as your Protestant professors haue bene to vs, how easilie might I foist and imbreast my selfe (after your example) into your Protestant bolome, hauing to cleare confession from their mouths for the allowance of Communion vnder one kind?

But

But we scorne such beggarlie, and base shifts, as to shelter our selues vnder the winges of such nouell witnesse, or to come in with such forrie deuises at *M. Preston* doth, saying. *These were not alone; here was our Church, and they profess the faith wee doe*: which yet would serue vs to no other purpose, but to make the world to laugh at our pouertie. From the free confession of our professed foes, and your professed friends, I am next by promise to proue the same by *Reason*. God grant I may finde you, and my other Protestant friends, but men of *Reason*, and all I hope will goe well in the end.

I say then *first* (as I haue said before) that according to our faith and doctrine, whole Christ, with his *Diuinitie, Flesh, Blood* and *B. Soule*, is containd vnder one only *Species*, yea, vnder the least particle of ether species, and consequently confers the whole effect, as well vnder one, as vnder both, or he is not. If yea, then he who receiueth one kind alone, receiueth Christ. If no, then neither hee who receiueth vnder both: For Christ as the Apostle saith, is not diuided.

I say *secondly*, admit that Christ be there (as some Protestants, and *Sir Humfrey* seemes to say) but only spiritually by his grace, ether he who should receiue their Communion in one kind alone, and not in the other, should receiue Christ, or he should not: should receiue some grace, or hee should not. If not, receiuing only vnder one, how then receiuing vnder both? If Christ be not vnder

the

the one, if no grace at all be vnder the one, *how* is ether Christ, or any grace vnder the other? *How*, or *why*, is grace restrayned from the one species, and so plentifully poured into them receiued together? If some grace in the one, and some in the other, then grace being receiued vnder one Species, one Species alone may bee receiued for the getting of grace.

I say *thirdly*, that in spirituall things (taking it ether in our, or in their owne sence) one and the same is the foode, both of soule and bodie: not so of corporall, according as the Scripture saith, *Blessed are they that hunger, and thirst after iustice.* Now, the bread of the Communion being taken alone, is ether a spirituall thing, or it is not. It ether feedeth the soule, and the body, or it doth not. If it be a spirituall thing, then feedeth it both soule and body: then confers it grace to the one, and to the other. If it feede both soule and body, then sufficeth it to receiue vnder one kind alone, like as *Manna* sufficed both to extinguish thirst, & besides tasted to the eaters, whatsoeuer they desired.

I say *fourthly*, that Christ did not therfore institute the Sacrament vnder both kinds, to the end that all the faithfull should so *communicat*, but that it should be so *Consecrated*, and *Offered* vnto him. There is a mayne, and most essentiall difference, betwixt *Institution* in two kinds, and *Commandment* of receiuing vnder two kindes. We freely confesse the one, we flatly deny the other. Proue

vs this out of expresse scripture, you who admit nothing but scripture for the Rule of your faith? We alleadge you, we shew you the contrary, that Christ with his owne hands communicated some of the faithfull vnder one kinde alone.

I say yet *fifthly* more; Admit it were the *Commaundment* of Christ, yea and the *Practise* also of the primitiue Church, read we not in holy scripture, where the expresse *Commaundment* of God hath beene broken without sinne? as, in *Dauids* eating of the shew-bread *Leuit. 24.*? the omission of Circumcisiõ *Gen. 17. & 34.*? the eating of things strangled? the baptising of Infants, and the like? Now, if in Baptisme, the Church by the direction of the holy Ghost, hath turned *Immerſion*, into *Aſperſion*, without any iniury to that Sacrament, to auoid the danger of death of Infants, why may ſhe not do the like in this Sacrament of the Supper, to auoid the danger of ſpilling the precious blood of *Ieſus Chriſt*, it not being of the ſubſtance of the Sacrament, which is wholly and ſubſtantiallie as well vnder one kinde, as vnder both?

I ſay *ſixtly*, that euen in the moſt pure and primitiue times, the Sacrament was not only giuen to men and wemen, but euen to ſucking infants alſo; and that not only vnder the ſpecies of *bread* & *wine* to thoſe that were of greater ſtrength, but to others that were more tender vnder the ſpecies of *wine* only, without the bread (which they were not able for to ſwallow:) Dares any Proteſtant, or dares *Sir Humfrey* deny this? If nor, then

is it as cleare as day, that those Fathers held this point of Doctrine for a thing indifferent. If Protestants also, contrary to their practise, deny at this present to give it to children (which they approved) and let them die without it, they following our example in the one, why kick they, why wrinch they against the other, but that they will still strue against the streame, and still take the *Wolfe by the eare*, although they endanger themselves therby notoriously.

I say *seauenthly*, that one chiefe Reason of the Churches practise herein, was, to extinguish the heresie of the *Nestorians*: who held, that vnder the forme of bread, the body of Christ was contayned without his blood: and vnder the forme of wine, his blessed blood without his body. For if vnder the forme of bread the body of Christ were, without his blood: or vnder the forme of wine, his blood were without his body, soule and diuinitie, then those that should receiue the Communion, should receiue the body of Christ, but not truly and indeed Christ: because it were an absurd kind of speech, and neuer heard of, as *Caluine* confesseth, to tearme Christ, the body of Christ. Reioyn-der to D. Whites Reply pag. 308.

I say *eighthly*, that the Reseruatiō of the B. Sacramēt, prefigured in the old law by the reseruing of the *shew-bread*, is a sufficient testimonie of this truth for God appointed no figure in vaine; nor cā Protestants produce the thing figured by the Reseruatiō of the *shew-bread* in the old law, but

by the *Reseruation* of the B. Sacrament vnder the forme of bread only, in the new.

I say ninthly, that the practise of this point, euen in the Apostles times, is likewise a sufficient testimony of this truth. *S. Clement*, discipule of *S. Peter*, and of whom *S. Paul* makes mencion, setting downe the order vted about the B. Sacrament in his time: saith thus. *Tribus gradibus &c. The Sacraments of the diuine secrets, are comitted to three degrees, to the Priest, to the Deacon, and to the Minister, which ought with feare and trembling (note) to keepe the leauing of the peeces of the holie of our Lord, least any corruption be found in the holie place: least when any thing is negligently done, great wrong be done to the porcion of our Lords bodie: thus, S. Clement. epist. 2.* Whence is to be noted 1. That doubtlesse he learned this doctrine of his master *S. Peter*, and the other Apostles. 2. That the leauings and peeces, were euen from that time, accustomed to be kept: which must needes be vnderstood only of the bread, for wine (in so smale a quantitie) cannot be said to be kept by peeces. 3. That he calls the thing so kept, the *holie portion of our Lords body*. 4. (Which makes the matter the more cleare) that this thing was to be kept with *feare and trembling*: which importeth the presence of another manner of thing, then only of a peece of bread. 5. That this holy thing was to be kept in some *holie place*. 6. And lastly, that it was to be kept for some long time, else the officers and keepers therof, should neuer haue bene so straightly charged to be circumspect

cumſpect that no *corruption* ſhould be found about it. All which clearly convinceth, both the Reſervation, & adminiſtration therof in one kind only, and that euen from the primitive & *Apoſtles* times.

I ſay *tenthly*, that there are many which haue vowed neuer to taſt nor drinke wine. It was ſaid of *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, Vine and Bere he ſhal not drinke. Reade wee not *Acts* 18. 18. of certaine *Nazarites*, which dranke no wine till the end of their vow? Of theſe therefore it is credible, that they dranke not of the Chalice of our Lord, becauſe this had bene contrary to their vow: and yet the Euangelist *Saint Luke* ſaith, *all were perſeuering in the communication of the breakinge of bread*; and many learned men note vpon this place, that *Saint Luke* ſpoke of one ſpecies, as I haue ſhewed a litle before.

I ſay *eleuenthly* and laſtly, that from the ancient praſtiſe, both of the *Reſervation* and *Adminiſtration* of the B. Sacrament, vnder one kinde only, and from the great Taciturnity and *ſilence* of our *Aduerſaries* and *Opponents*, this verity is moſt clearly conuinced. For if our Catholique praſtiſe herein had bene expreſſie againſt *Chriſts Inſtitution*; If it had bene a *maniſeſt error* in the Church of Rome, and ſuch as a very *childe* might haue diſcouered; If it had bene maintained in *deſpight* of God and man, as *Sir Humfrey* dreameth: was ether God become ſo weake that he could not, or ſo careleſſe that he would not reueng his owne quarell? Or was the whole Reformed Church ſo ſeceleſſe, or ſo ſpeechleſſe,

leſſe, that neuer an one in the whole Chriſtian world, would once take the cauſe in hād till theſe our dayes, eſpecially then whē this pretended erroneous doctrine was moſt apparant? What a drouſie dreame is this? What a ſimple, what a ſenceleſſe ſuppoſition. All hiſtories, all controuerſies, all relations, all Proteſtant pennes, are vtterly ſilent in this caſe, and yet forſooth wee muſt ſuppoſe that this was done *in deſpight of God and man*, and nether God nor man euer oppoſing Papists in this point for a thouſand yeares and vpward perſeuering ſtill in this uſe and praſtiſe?

Thus far haue I thought good to enlarge my ſelfe, and to proue this point, from the *figures* of the *old Teſtament*: from the truth of the *new*: from manifeſt *Miracles*: from the praſtiſe of the *primitiue Church*: from the confeſſion of our *Aduerſaries*: and from the light, of naturall *Reaſon*. What can any Proteſtant deſire more? You haue ample ſcope to fetch your blow, if you pleaſe to reply. But to itch forward in this vncooth *Way*.

Sir Humfrey pag. 174.

He that ſhall heare two great Councils, the one accuſing, the other accuſing all for heretiques that deny the vnlawfulnes of one kind, without dout would be glad to know what were thoſe cauſes & reaſons, that induced the Romā Church to decree flatly againſt Chriſts (56. *vntruth*) precept, and the example of the primitiue (57. *vntruth*) Church. I will therefore declare them in brief: the
weightie

weightie causes were these. (viz.) The length of lay mens beards, the loathsomnes to drinke after others, the costlinesse and difficultie of getting wine, the frostes in winter, the flies in sommer, the burthen of bearing, the danger of spilling, and the peoples vnworthines to equall the Priests, in receiuing in both kinds.

A N S W E R.

1. You both dallie, *Sir Humfrey*, with diuine thinges, and seeke to deceiue notoriouslye. If the length of lay mens beards, and some other trifles wherof you tell vs, had bene the cause that those two great Councells, flatly decreed against Christs precept; how might they not haue easily redressed that, by commanding the cutting of their beards shorter, as the Apostle did about matters of far lesse moment, to wit, the shearing or couering of womens heads because of the Angels? This truly is to furnish the Turke with scoffing Arguments against the rites of Christians, and the Maiestie and Authoritie of sacred Councells. Your beard belike, was ether too long, or your lips hung in your sight, that you could not consider this.

2. Touching *frosts in Winter, and flies in summer*, with other *prouisoos* for the better preserving of so venerable a Sacrament, notwithstanding your carping therat, argues, the great respect and reuerence we Catholiques beare, vnto the sacred mysteries of our Religion. And contrarywise, the poore Protestant *prouisoos* against spiders, flies, or other vermine, falling in *summer*, as also against

the frost in *Winter*: any prouiso whether it be good or bad, sweet or sower, or what is to be done in case it should be ouerturned or spilt on the ground (none of all which are impossible) I confesse vnto you, I reade of none in your *Booke of Morninge Prayer*, where yet the order of your Communion is prescribed: all which, with a great deale more (carefully provided for by the Catholike Church) is neglected and carelesly slubbered over by your English, which yet pretends to haue reduced all things to greater perfection then the Papists. Only I finde that one Rubricall prouiso, worthy of note. *If any of the Bread or Wine remayne, the Curat shall haue it to his owne vse*: so poore a prouiso, and spoken in so generall tearmes, that if he would put it into his portage pot, or crumble it to his Hennes or Capons to cramme them withall: or inuite his neighbours and gossips to diner or supper, and drinke off the rest in healths and caroules to his companions, no Rubrique, nor no threatened penaltie or punishment, doth therè restraine him. Which plainly bewrayes, a very prophane and bale conceit, Protestants haue of their owne Communion; far from the care I lately recounted *S. Clement* had, and other like faire flowers of the primitive Church: far from the State, the Maiestie, the Reuerence, the Riches, the Ornaments, the Reseruacion, the Adoration, the Deuotion, and the Angelicall care and attendance, which we Catholiques exhibit about our Communion and Sacramentall species; so that the very

basenes

basenes of the one, doth of it selfe *debase* it. The very *State* and *Maiestie* of the other, doth of it selfe, highlie dignifie and *extoll* it.

3. But to touch brieflie your particulars. I say *first*, that it is *flatly* false, that the Roman Church hath *decreed flatly against Christs precept*. Christ I cōfesse communicated *all* his Apostles vnder both Species, yet did not therefore precisely *command*, that it should be given to *all* vnder both species, as he gaue it them. Nor were the 12. Apostles, *all* men. Nor yet are *all* men, Apostles. The *Institution* we confesse: the *Precept* we deny: proue vs that out of Scripture. Or rather tell vs, why did God make one man alone, and one woman alone at the first, who could haue made so many millions? Why did he preach to one *Samaritan* alone? Why appeared he to one *Magdalen* alone, to one *Thomas* alone, if now he will not impart his grace in this holy Sacrament, to one alone? This riddle, I confes, vterly surpasses my reason; Nay, I haue proued to the contrary, that Christ himselfe, approued both by *word* and by *deed*, the vse of one species only, which you can neuer be able to disproue, vnlesse you can proue Christ to be contrary to him selfe.

4. I say *secondly* (omitting the bable of the lenght of lay mens beardes) that *the loathsomnes to drinke after other*, if we weigh (as truly religious Christians ought) the reuerentiall respect due vnto so diuine a Sacrament, might in part, be a motiue to induce the Church to ordaine receiuing

vnder one kind. For, are there not some who haue some continual issues or cankers in their mouthes, throates, or faces? Are there not also some, who are so weake and choise of complexion (as women with child and sickly persons) that to drinke after such an one, would cause them to vomit? What a horrible and vnseemely sight were it, to see such a thing in the Church, publickely in the presence of others, and with such irreuerence to so great a Sacrament? Or how haue you provided against so great a perill, otherwise then that the Minister shall haue it to his owne vse? And therefore according to that trimme Reformed order, euē a Gods name, let him haue it to his owne vse.

[5. I say thirdly for all the other Reasons brought by you, as, *the costlinesse, and difficultie of getting Wine, the frosts in winter, the flies and heats of some contries in summer, the danger of spilling,* and the like, what say you to the exceeding dearth of wine in *Iaponia*? To the continuall soudenness therof in *Noruegia*? What would you haue the poore Christian members of those remote Churches doe in this case? Thinke you that it is as plentie with them, as it is with you? I woulde no. It as in a sermon of *S. Peters* whereat three thousand soules were conuerted, three thousand Christian soules should communicate, some wherof should be old men, some children, some sicke, some weake, some hauing the sh. king palsie in their heads or handes, some clownish and carelesse people, in filling out, and giuing the cup from hand to hand to so great

a companie, and but one Priest to serve them all, what inconueniences, what incongruities might be committed? What abundance of drops of that pretious liquor might be spilled on the ground? Truly this plainly sheweth, heresie and malice of mind so much to haue blinded your iudgment, that you are indeed one of those of whom our Sauiour saith, *Eyes they haue and see not, eares they haue and heare not, their foolish hart is blinded*, who refuse to *heare the Church* commanding, and the Apostle prescribing, *let all thinges be done honestly and according to order among you.* 1. Cor. 14. 40.

Sir Humfrey pag. 175.

But admit, nether the wordes, *Drinke yee all of this, nor, Do this in remembrance of me*, were binding precepts (as without all question they are) must therefore Priests and people be adiudged heretikes & accursed Christiãs, because they follow Christs example? *It is not to be doubted, but that is best and fittest to be practised which Christ himselfe hath done.* This is *Bellarmins* confession; this is ours.

A N S W E R.

I say first, you play here with vs, *Sir Humfrey*, as you did before in the first Section, about your *two* chymericall and imagined *Sisters*. When you are no way able to proue your false assertions, when you fall short of your pretensions, then forthwith, we must take them vp vpon your naked authoritie, as thinges that *cannot be denied*, and as things

things out of *all question*, only because your selfe say it, though your grandfir *Luther* is quite against you: this is very slight and sorrie stuffe to deceiue with all. Proue me out of expresse scripture, that ether of these are *a binding precept* (otherwise then as it comprehendeth Priests only, and their *Consecration* and *Oblation*) and for this prooffe alone I protest to turne Protestant.

I say *secondly*, admit them both for *binding precepts*, doe not all priests, thorough out the whole world performe the same in our Religion? Did you euer see, did you euer heare, or can you name so much as one that doth the contrary, and that his fact is ether followed, or approued? If not, how vnderstand you then these words of Christ, *Drink yee all of this?* and, *Doe this in remembrance of me?* Suppose you they were spoke to *all*, without restriction? If so, then not only no Christians, but no Iewes, Turkes or Tartars, must be denyed the Communion Cup, if they require it? If so, then not only men, but little children, should be admitted to drinke of that Cup, Christ hauing said, *suffer little children* to come vnto me, for to such belongs the kingdome of heauen (*Mat. 19. 13.* which yet euen your selues deny them. Nay, if *all* were vnderstood without restriction, then not only *all* lay men, should *all drinke of this*, but they also, and their wiues, yea and their children should *do*, that which Christ did, and Consecrate in both kindes, as well as the wisest Minister among you. *Iesus* who euer met with a weaker man?

man? Iesus, Sir Humfrey, that you will vndertake to returne Challenges against Iesuits!

Sir Humfrey pag. 177.

In the meane time I will tender them the performance of my promise (58. *vntruth*) which is the confession of their learned Doctors, in the bosome of their owne Church, who are faithfull witnesses in behalfe of our Church (59. *vntruth*) and doctrine, that the Communion in both kinds, had knowen antiquitie from Christ, and an eminent visibilitie in the ancient Church: and that the halfe Communion was so far from a point of faith, that it was not generally receiued in the true Church aboue a thousand yeares after Christ. (And then you cite *Salmeron* the Iesuit, *Ioannes Arboreus*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Lyra*, *F. Fisher* the Iesuit, *Alphonfus de Castro*, *Gregorie de Valencia*, all as ranke Papists as euer liued, except *Tapper* and *Cassander* whom we haue oft discarded for hereticks.

A N S W E R.

1. It is false. Sir Humfrey that this is the performance of your promise. It is false that your Church and Doctrine, had a knowen antiquitie from Christ, and an eminent visibilitie in the ancient Church. Your promise, your vndertaking is, to produce visible Protestant Professors: that you would make the World so know, that it is no difficult matter for a meane lay man to performe this: these were visible Papist Professors; You according to the Challenge,

lenge, and your vndertaking, should produce faithfull witnessers of your owne Church and Doctrine; from Protestant Churches, and Protestant Doctors of your owne, not from ours; a *Catalogue of names of such Protestants, as taught and profess in all Ages the 39. Articles of your Religion* (epist. ded. pag. 9.) *Distinct*, (as I haue formerly tould you) from the Roman; Protestant fully in all particulars; purely without admixtion of any damnable error; orderly descended vnder lawfull guides & Pastors; perpetually without the note of manifest change or interruption; this is the true state of the question: this the scope of the Iesuits Challenge: this is your vndertaking: this that which only can satisfie our expectation.

2. Againe, neuer an one of these liued nothing neere a thousand yeares agoe. From *Salmeron* to the Councell of *Cōstance*, you haue cited only ten Authorities, wherof the one halfe, that is to say, five of them, liued all since *Luther*, and some of them are yet alīue. How are these such as liued, especially in the Ages before *Luther*? Neuer an one of these succede one another by lineall descent, but somtimes you leape ouer six hundred, somtimes three hundred yeares together, without a visible professor betwixt one another, how then were these in all Ages? Neuer an one of these, though they witnessed that *Communion is both kindes, had knowne Antiquitie from Christ*, yet neuer meant they, nor neuer dreamt they of this new Communion of you deuising. Lord how you still
seeke

seeke to deceiue! Lord how you multiplie vntruths one in the neck of another, and yet performe the same so palpable, that euen a childe may plainly perceiue it!

3. Againe, neuer an one of these, were they examined at large, make any whit at all against vs. We confesse both with *Salmeron*, and *Ioannes Arboreus*, that it was the custome in times past; but doth ether of them say it was our Saviours precept, or condemne the other custome? Nothing lesse.

4. We grant with *S. Thomas* also that it was the ancient custome, that all those who were partakers of the Communion of his bodie, were partakers also of the Communion of his blood: but doth *Saint Thomas* say, that both flesh and blood might not be communicated vnder one kinde? Or that to receiue vnder one kinde, was expressly repugnant to Christs commandment? Or do you communicate his body & blood? Or can you not distinguish betwixt custome and commandment?

5. That of *Father Fisher* is directly for vs and against you, how inbreast you your selfe then in his bolome, who testifieth that they were bound therunto by the obligation of custome, not diuine precept: the very same that wee say, how for Gods sake, makes this for you, or how make you him and other Iesuits here named by you, visible professors of your Protestant Church?

6. To close vp therefore this paragraph remembre I pray you, what I haue tould *M. Preston*, hee cannot

cannot be said to bee, neither of our Religion, nor yet of yours, who houlds somthing with vs, and somthing against vs, especially when the point is essentiall vnto faith. Bee wiler, then hauing named Friars and Iesuits (as you haue done here) to singe after him that witlesse song, *These were not alone, here was our Church, and they profess the faith wee doe;* but according to your promise and vndertaking, come out with your Catalogue, especially sith your selfe confesse, *It is an vndouted truth and subscribed vnto by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages.* Sith truth it selfe also telleth vs. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worck of the Ministrie, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill we meete all into, the vnitie of faith.

7. This vndouted truth, Sir, is that we seeke for: it is very doutfull whether Salmeron the Iesuit, Ioannes Arboreus, S. Thomas of Aquin, Nicholaus de Lyra, Fisher the Iesuit, Alphonsus a Castro, Gregorie of Valentia, and the Councell of Constance, were Reformed Protestants, yea or no: nay the quite cōtrary is most certaine, deliuer vs the fore out of doubt. Wee aske after Protestant Apostles, Protestant Prophets, Protestant Euangelists, Protestant Pastors, and Protestant Doctors, after Protestant Saints, after Protestant Ministers, to whose charge the building vp the body of Christ was commended,

ded, from the first age, vntill they meete all in the vnitie of faith to this our Age.

8. It was now iust Christmas day, when I studied and wrote this question. The gospell of this day read in my hearing at the time of holy Masse, were the wordes of those blessed shepheards, saying one to another : *Let vs goe ouer to Bethelem, and see this Word that is done, Which our Lord hath shewed to vs.* Luc. 2. 15. This presently posset my thoughts with the like desire, that you *Sir Humfrey*, would once say vnto vs, let vs goe ouer to *Bohemia*, to *Brasilia*, to *Germanie*, to *Italie*, or to *Viginea*, and we will presentlie shew you those so much desired *visible Protestant Professors* which our Lord hath shewed to vs, especially in the ages before *Luther*, I truly for my part could be content with the *Queen of Saba*, 1. Reg. 10. to take vpon me a long iorney, to see the face, and heare the wisdom of such a *Salomon*. If you be not able to doe this, shame then so fondly to say,

Sir Humfrey pag. 181.

Thus wee haue heard with our eares, and our Aduersaries haue declared vnto vs, that our Communion (60. *vnt ruth*) in both kinds, was taught by the Fathers in their dayes, and in the old time before them; I hope I shall not neede any supplementall prooffe for the Antiquity of our doctrine, and the visibilitie of our Church in this point, when they themselues haue ginen so faire an euidence in our behalle (61. *vnt ruth*.) And as concerning

ning the halfe Communion which is receiued in the Roman Church for an Article of faith, as it wants Antiquitie and Consent of Fathers (62. *vntruth*) by their owne confession, so likewise it wants a right foundation in the Scriptures (63. *vntruth*) which an Article of faith ought to haue. And therefore S. Austens profession, shall be my conclusion. *If wee, or an Angell from heauen, preach vnto you any thing (concerning the faith of receiuing the Sacrament in both kindes) besides that you haue receiued in the Legall and Euangelicall scriptures, let him be accursed.*

A N S W E R.

1. Nether you, nor we, *haue heard with our eares*, any such thing as you pretend. Nether you for your selues, nor your Aduersaries for you, *haue declared vnto vs*, that which hath bene so long looked for; *Where was your Church before Luther?* A supplementall prooffe, for the perpetuall visibilitie of your Church, is still as needfull as ever it was. *Ours*, are none of *yours*. You haue of your owne to giue euidence in your behalfe, without the helpe of *ours*, or you haue not. If you haue of your owne; then produce them, then let ours alone. If you haue none of your owne to giue euidence in your behalfe, then nether haue *we heard with our eares*, no more thē with our heeles; *Where was your Church before Luther.* Then haue not your Aduersaries declared vnto you, that which you cannot declare for your selues. Which till you declare after a clearer manner,

ner, it were more for your credit to confesse vnto vs in plaine tearmes, that you cannot doe it. Let you *Doctrin* alone; Recount the *N-ames* of your *Doctors*; *Number* your *Bishops* from first to last, *orderly*, *successuely*, and *interruptedly*, following and succeeding one another; *Distinct*, and standing in opposition to the Church of Rome, as *M. Pre-
ston* hath attempted; Else Christ and *S. Austens* profession, shall be my conclusion. If you, or an *Angell from heauen* preach vnto v any thing (concerning the false inbreasting of Protestant *Doctrin* in our bosome, without any *Doctors* (besides that we haue receiued in the Legall and Euangelicall scriptures (which assure vs of this perpetuall succession) let him be accursed.

z. Lastly, as concerning our *halse Communion* (as you please to call it) we haue proued it by most ample, & irrefragable proofes to be a whole one: we haue further proued, that you haue wrestled (though most vnfortunately) with sacred *Miracles*, with ancient *Fathers*, with recent *Authors* of your own *Religiō*, with natural *Reason*, but principally with the Angell of God him selfe, that is to say, with his *Written Word*, and haue got the worst; which hath shrunke vp a sinew in your thigh, wherof you will limpe as long as you liue; whereto therfore without repetition I remit you. Meane while I further tell you, that there is far more giuen (and that by infinit degrees) vnder one only species in ours, vnder one least particle in ours, then in both yours taken together, which haue

only an outward shew, without any substance. An emptie blast, and emptie blather, swelled vp indeed in exterior bignesse to some likely bulke, but being pricked with the least pienne, haue nothing elle but wind within. Lets put on with you to the next Paragaghe, which is.

Parag. VII.

Prayer and Seruice in a knowne tongue.

Sir Humfrey pag. 183.

THe Councell of Trent decreed and declared concerning the diuine seruice in an vnknowne tongue, that *although the Masse do containe in it great instruction for the common people, yet it doth not seeme expedient to the Fathers of the Councell, that it should be euery where celebrated in the vulgar tongue.* This Decree being paste, they proceed to iudgement, that *whosoever shall say he is to be condemned, that pronounceth part of the Canon (of the Masse) and the Words of Consecration with a low voice, or that the Masse ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue only, let him be accursed.*

A N S W E R.

Still, Sir Humfrey, you seeke to deceive. Still you fly the state of the question. Still you vse that trick of *Interuersion* whereof I haue so often told you.

you. You were restrayned, you were limited by virtue of the *Iesuits Challenge*, and your owne vnder-taking to one Article, to one Argument, to one particular point alone, viz. of producing the visible Protestant Professors of your Reformed Church, especially in the Ages before Luther. You, not standing your ground, stragle from the search of such a Church, to the various and intricate examination of sundry controuersies about *Iustification by faith only*, the *Sacrament of Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper*, *Transubstantiation*, *Prisat Masse*, the *Seauen Sacraments*, *Communion in both kinds*, *Prayer and Seruice in a known tongue*, *Worship of Images*, and *Indulgences*, besides a great number more of intricate questions which I omit. Now what is all this but a subtill flight to starr vp, and set many hares on foote at once, so to make the first chace the more vncertaine? To make the hounds runne vpon a doutfull foote, so to keepe them from finding the Foxes hole? This proposition of the perpetuity of visible Protestant professors is but one, they are many. This is euident, they are intricate. The way of satisfaction by particular search, nature hath not made the common sort capable of, as is the meanes to resoluue them by the way of *Traditiue doctrine* from hand to hand, from Bishop to Bishop, from Church to Church, from fathers to children, from Christ and his Apostles Age vnto this present. This I thought good to tell you by the way, to discouer, to my beloued friends (for whose sake I haue vndergone this labour) the

Danger, Crookednes, and Vncertainie of your pretended Safe Way, which premised, I am content for their sakes, to talke with you about an vnknown tongue, as I haue done about your Crooked and vknown Way.

I. To come therefore to the particulars of this Paragraph, I answer first, true it is, the holy Councell you speake of iudged it not *expedient*, that the Masse should be euery where celebrated in the vulgar tongue. What say you to the decree of this holie Councell? What say you to her, who saith thus to you. *Visum est spiritui sancto & nobis. Acts 15. 28.* so it hath seemed good to the holy Ghost and vs? What say you to him, who saith thus to you, *he who heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me: He that will not heare the Church, let him be to thee as an heathen and a publican.* Will you expose your selfe to all these perills?

Sir Humfrey pag. 184.

Now it is worth the noting, that the first part of the decree, was adiudged by some Trent Bishops, to be questionable and doutfull in the construction; for, say they, *It seemed a contradiction to declare, that the Masse doth containe much instruction for the faithfull, and yet to command, that part of the service be vtered with a low voice, & in an vknown tongue.* This exception, it seemes, tooke some impression in the Councell; for in the same chapter, and in the same session, a dispensation was granted,

ted, with a *Non obstante*, notwithstanding the first part of the decree, that *Retayning the ancient right to every Church, lest the people might hunger and thirst for foode, and none be ready to giue it them, it was thence forth commaunded and decreed, that the Masse priests, or some others, should frequently expound and declare the mysteries of the Masse, which the people could not vnderstand* (64. *vnt ruth*) in the Latin tongue: so that from their owne confessions, that *the Masse doth afford great instruction to the people, and for that end ought to be interpreted vnto them, they consequently affirme, that the seruice and prayer in the Reformed Churches in the vulgar tongue, was better for the edification of the Church. And without dout, the Apostles being commaunded (to shew forth the Lords death till his coming) did not intend to shew it to the walles, or in a silent and vnknown voice (as it is now vied in the Roman Church) but to pronounce it openlie to be heard, and vnderstood of all the hearers.*

A N S W E R.

To this I answer *first*, that it is indeed *worth the noting*, that you cannot distinguish betwixt that which *seemeth* to be a contradiction, and is none; and that which *seemeth* a contradiction and indeed is one. It *seemeth* by this, that your skill in Logique, is very litle, who cannot define a Contradiction.

I say *secondly*, may not a thing containe much instruction, and yet be vntered with a low voice, and

in an vnknown tongue? Suppose the man who (Luc. 10. 30.) descending from Hierusalem to Hiericho fell among theeues, and was sorely wounded of them, should in that plight haue bene exhibited to no other pittifull Samaritan, then your selfe; Suppose next, that to receiue some assistance or succour from you, for lack of force, he vtters, he exposes his miserie and his wants, vnto you, both with a very weake and low voice, and in an vnknown tongue, shall I imagine you so senselesse that you can conceiue nothing out of such a sight? Or so incapable to say that it cōtaines no instruction? Lord how plainly you seeke to deceiue, and yet performe the same to palpably!

I say *thirdly*, that it is false that *the people could not vnderstand the mysteries of the Masse in the Latin tongue.* For it is one thing to vnderstand all the mysteries; another thing to vnderstand the Latin tongue. Many of the mysteries of the Masse may be vnderstood, by him that vnderstands neuer a word Latin, or is so speechlesse, that he cannot speake a word of any language in the world. When a wicked wretch in your Reformed religion, at the time of Masse, lifted vp a Dogge over his head to deride the act of Eleuation, *vnderstood he not the meaning of that mysterie,* for lack of the Latin tongue? When a Minister, some three myles from Canterburie, to abuse a Catholique gentleman, for that he would not part with a peece of land that lay commodiously for him, nayled an ougly roade by handes and feete vpon two Crosse lathes,
and

and stuck the same (in Doctor *Whitgifts* dayes) before the gentlemen dore, vnderstood he not, exprest he not his malice sufficiently against the mysterie of the Crosse? and did not that whole familie of the Catholiques vnderstand the mysterie well enough, although they vnderstood not the Latin tongue? Lord how your owne English vulgar tongue betrayes you, you who haue the learned Latin tongue? Lord that you should seeke thus with your learning, to deceiue the simple and vnlearned?

I say fourthly, that from the Councells decree, that Priests should frequently expound to the people the mysteries of the holy Masse, can any consequence be borrowed thence to approue the seruice and prayer of the Reformed Churches in the vulgar tongue? This were very vnwisely done of the Church of Rome teing Robert Wisdome, the Author of the last of all the English Psalmes singeth thus,

Preserue vs Lord by thy deare word,

*From Pope and Turke defend vs Lord,
Which both would thrust out of his throne,*

*Our Lord Iesus Christ thy deare Sonne,
And in the Confession of the Christian faith which followes after the end of the English psalmes, the doctrine of the Masse, Purgatorie, Limbus patrum, prayers to Saints, and for the dead, free will, distinction of meates, apparrell, and dayes, vowes of single life, and the like, are all tearmed the doctrine of diuels. How improbable then that they intended by their owne confession, or by any consequence, to approue the*

service, prayers or Confession of faith of your Reformed Churches, so contrary in many points to her owne service and faith? This is iust like the *faux euidence* which the same Church and Councell gaue before against them selues, in the behalfe of your Reformed Communion. Iust as like, as *Kise* and *Co*, the one having foure legges, the other but two. But lets a long.

Sir Humfrey pag. 188.

But I will spare the labour for further prooffe of this question, by citing the particular Fathers, and will produce our Aduerſaries ſeuerrall confessions, to witnesse the truth of our doctrine, that prayer and Service in the vulgar and knowen tongue, was altogether vsed in the best and first Ages, according to the precept of the Apostles, and the practise of the ancient Fathers.

A N S W E R.

Before this pag. 186 you bring the testimonie of *Haymo*, solemnely celebrating the myſterie of the Masse; How make you him a Protettâr, or a member of your Reformed Church? Do your Reformed Ministers now say Masse?

Pag. 187. *Iustinian* the Emperour (alleged forsooth by *G. Casander*, whom I neuer saw) giuing a strict command to Religious Priests, how to celebrate with deuotion, the sacred Oblation of the Lords Supper. Are there any Religious priests in your Reformed Church? Is there any Oblation in the cele-

celebration of your Supper, such as Iustinian vnderstood?

After this pag. 188. you cite *Lyra*, saying that in the primitive Church, the blessings, and all other common deuotions, were performed in the vulgar tongue: which though graunted, are not many things, performed in the primitive Church, altered at this day in your Reformed Churches? That which I haue lately spoken about Priuat Masse, pag. 172. may suffice to satisfie any reasonable man; If not, yet one *blackpudding* alone, is able to make you all black.

That of *Belethius*, speakes of preaching; what's this to prayer? Nay that which your selfe cite out of him, saying; *And hereof grew a laudable custom, that after the gospell was read, it should straight way be expounded in the vulgar tongue*: insinuates, that in the primitive Church, the gospell was read in one tongue, and expounded in another.

That of *Greizerus* pag. 189. of the peoples singing some spirituall hymnes or Canticles, together with the priests, we condemne not; yea, the vulgar people, commonly practise at this day in the Catholique Church, singing *Veni Creator spiritus*, in the poorest village or parish that is, together with the parish Priest. Ar you able to deny this? Why bring you then such toyish testimonies, hauing nether head nor taylor, to hurt those against whom you bring them?

That of *M. Harding* pag. 190. is already satisfied

fied in that of *Lyra*. Wherto I adde, that were this custome graunted in the *Greeke Church* and *Hebrue Church* in the first beginning, nether is the alteration therof, a matter of faith or saluation, nor at all the Protestants alie able to proue the admission or practise therof in the *Latin* (the only Church that hath stood a foote since their fall.) If they be, let them produce the *bookes* and *monuments* which in so many Churches and so many Ages (if it were so) must needes make some mention of this matter.

That of *Cassander* pag. *ibid.* we haue cassied, and long since disclaymed both the man, and his writings. It is labour lost to vrge him as ours.

That of *Waldensis*, belongeth to preaching, why vrge you it against publique prayer? He was a Religious man: Pröuinciall of the Carmelits: one so famous in the dayes of his Kinge, that he was commonly said, to rule the kingdome: and lastly he was a Massing Priest, said he euer the same in the English tongue? Lord how sensibly you seeke to deceiue!

That of the Angelicall Doctor *Thomas Aquinas*, what say you against it? It is now some 400. yeares a goe since the dayes and writings of that famous Doctor, can you tell vs, can you name vs that one Reformed Protestant, that euer opposed him in this point before the dayes of *Martin Luther*? Name if you can, but only one to make your Church visible in that Age, and I freely remit you all the rest. If you cannot performe this, then, Ob-
musset,

mutesce, hould your peace, and employ you tongue no more against the Seruice in an vnknownen tongue.

That of *Bellarmino* pag. 192. What say you therto? *When the Christians were but few, they did all sing together, at the time of diuine seruice.* When they were but few (as perhaps the whole Church as yet but of one Nation) would you then the priest should haue sung in English, and they, in Hebrue? What confusion would haue followed? Or was there nothing at all in the primitive Seruice but only singing? Who euer heard so iarring a longe? You goe forward and say.

Sir Humphrey pag. 193.

Now as you haue heard the reasons, why the seruice was vsed amongst the Auncients in the knownen tongue, so likewise you shall vnderstand one speciall cause of the alteration of it in the Roman Church. It is recorded (saith *Honorius*) when the Canon of the Masse in the primitive times was publicquely read and vnderstood of all, certaine Shepheards hauing learned the wordes of Consecration, and pronouncing them ouer their bread & wine in the fieldes, suddenly their bread and wine were transubstantiated into flesh and blood, and the Shepheards likewise for their presumption (in vsing the wordes of Consecration) were stricken dead by the hand of God. So that by *Honorius* confession, the Canon of the Masse, was anciently read and vnderstood of all; & which

fied in that of *Lyra*. Wherto I adde, that were this custome graunted in the *Greeke Church* and *Hebrue Church* in the first beginning, nether is the alteration therof, a matter of faith or saluation, nor at all the Protestants alieue able to proue the admission or practise therof in the *Latin* (the only Church that hath stood a foote since their fall.) If they be, let them produce the *bookes* and *monuments* which in so many Churches and so many Ages (if it were so) mult needes make some mention of this matter.

That of *Cassander* pag. *ibid.* we haue and long since disclaymed both the writings. It is labour lost to vrge him.

That of *Waldensis*, belongeth to a why vrge you it against publique a Religious man: Prouinciall of the so famous in the dayes of his King commonly said, to rule the kingdom he was a Massing Priest, said he eu the English tongue? Lord how sensible to deceiue!

That of the Angelicall Doctor *Thomas Aquinas*, what say you against it? It is now some 400. yeares agoe since the dayes and writings of that famous Doctor, can you tell vs, can you name vs that one Reformed Protestant, that euer opposed him in this point before the dayes of *Martin Luther*? Name if you can, but only one to make your Church visible in that Age, and I freely remit you all the rest. If you cannot performe this, then, *Obmutesce,*

mutefce, hould your peace, and employ you tongue no more againſt the Service in an vnknown tongue.

That of *Bellarmino* pag. 192. What ſay you therto? *When the Chriſtians were but few, they did all ſing together, at the time of diuine ſervice.* When they were but few (as perhaps the whole Church as yet but of one Nation) would you then the prieſt ſhould haue ſung in Engliſh, and they, in Hebrue? What confuſion would haue followed? Or was there nothing at all in the primitive Service but only ſinging? Who euer heard ſo iarring? You goe forward and ſay.

Sir Humfrey pag. 193.

as you haue heard the reaſons, why the was vſed amongſt the Auncients in the tongue, ſo likewise you ſhall vnderſtand ſpeciall cauſe of the alteration of it in the Ro-Church. It is recorded (ſaith *Honorius*) when Canon of the Maſſe in the primitive times was publiquely read and vnderſtood of all, certaine Shepheards hauing learned the wordes of Conſecration, and pronouncing them ouer their bread & wine in the fieldes, ſuddenly their bread and wine were tranſubſtantiated into fleſh and blood, and the Shepheards likewise for their preſumption (in vſing the wordes of Conſecration) were ſtrucken dead by the hand of God. So that by *Honorius* confeſſion, the Canon of the Maſſe, was anciently read and vnderſtood of all; & which
is

is strange, Shepheards did transubstantiate bread and wine, and (as it seemes) chiefly occasioned the alteration of the Church seruice, into the Latin and vnknown tongue. Pope Innocent, and Ioannes Beleshus relate the same storie, but withall adde another reason, why the Church decreed the seruice in an vnknown language, *Ne sacrosancta verba vilescerent*. The Church commanded, that such prayers and seruice should be secretly deliuered by the Priest, lest that the known words of the sacred Scripture should grow triuiall and of no account.

A N S W E R.

You haue giuen vs, Sir Humfrey, a Reason for the alteration of the Church seruice, into the Latin tongue; it were well for you, if you could giue but halfe so good a Reason for the ouerthrow of the old Religion, and letting vp a new, in your, and other Reformed Churches. Now, from this confession, I make vnto you this demand. You beleeue, you hould for truth, the storie which your selfe alleadge, or you do not. It is also true in it selfe, or it is not. If not true, to what purpose do you alleadge lyes vnto vs instead of truth? If not true, and yet true that the Church of that time (viz. of thoutand yeares standing) made that alteration against truth, name vs one, or more of your Reformed bretheren in all the world, who then opposed the Pope, and this so notable a change in the vniuersali Church? But if true, then the Church hauing so assured warrant from God him selfe for
her

her doings herein, how quake you not to question God? If true, then haue you brought a testimonie against your selfe, of nigh a thousand yeares standing for the *Masse*, for *Transubstantiation* of the bread and wine into the body and blood of *Iesus Christ*, for *Miracles*, and for the vengeance of God shewed vpon them, who vsed those sacred words in a vulgar tongue, or sung aloud, that which should haue bin vttered only by the Priest, and in silence. Will you neuer beware of taking the *Wolfe* by the eare? Now, after you haue tould your owne tale, will you giue vs leaue to tell ours?

We lay then first, that you who make the written word, *the sole Rule* of your Religion, should haue brought your grounds and Reasons from that *Rule*. If therefore you will not be too *vntruly*, heare what testimonies (and Reasons) I shall bring against you, taken from your owne *Rule*. And 1. from that of the old law, *Leuiticus 16. 17.* And there shall be no man in the *Tabernacle* of the congregation, when he (the Priest of God) goeth in to make an attonement in the holy place, vntill he come out, and haue made an attonement for him selfe, and for his houshold, and for all the congregation of *Israell*. Marke I pray, the pith and force of this place, against your new Reformed practise. For if by Gods commandment, no man might goe in, till the Priest came out: and yet an attonement be made for the whole congregation, how may not the prayers & Service of the Church, be offered vp to God in the behalfe of the congregation (and that frutefully) though

though in a tongue not vnderstood of the vulgar people?

Our second prooffe against your practise, shall be taken from that related in the new law *Luc. 1. 8.* And it came to passe, that while he executed the Priests office before God, in the order of his course according to the Custome of the Priests office, his lot was to burne Incense in the Temple of the Lord; and the whole multitude of people were praying without in the time of Incense. This place of holy scripture, sheweth and agreeth with the former (though two thousand yeares betwixt:) marke therefore I pray, the particulars. He (that is Zacharie) executed the Priestes office before God within the Temple, while the whole multitude of people were praying without. Now, be it that Zacharie prayed in the same, or in another tongue then the people did, alwayes provided, they heard not his words, and consequently vnderstood them not: the same to them as to haue prayed in an vnknownen tongue; *Autant vaile*, all comes to one; and yet as the sacred scripture saith, this was the Custome. Whats become now of your contrary Custome? For by this it appeareth, that the Priests function did profit the people, though they nether heard his words, nor saw his actions or his deedes. Well, and wittily said *S. Ierom to Nepotian.* An Arrow enters not into a stone, but star-ving back, sometimes hurts him that did shoote it, even so hath it done with you, in disputing this present point.

Our third prooffe, is taken from that of *S. Mat.*

21. 16. and agreeable to that of the Royall Prophet, psal. 8. 3. *S. Mathew* saith, *that the children cryed in the Temple, saying. Hosanna to the sonne of David.* And the same *Dauid* saith. *Out of the mouth of infants and sucklings, thou hast perfected praise:* from which two texts, of holy scripture we gather this. That sucklings, or young childrens prayers proceeding from the gracious instinct of Gods holy spirit, be acceptable to him: and consequentlie, the voices euen of litle children, or other simple and vnlearned people now in the latin tongue, though them selues vnderstand not particularly the words of their prayers: yet (as theirs were) are very gratefull vnto God.

Our fourth prooffe is taken from that of Rom. 8. 26. *The spirit helpeth our infirmity, for what we should pray as we ought, we know not: but the spirit himselfe requesteth for vs with groanings vnspokeable.* From these words of the Apostle we gather this; that the prayers of the deuout vulgar people, not knowing how to pray as they ought, or made in a tongue or language they vnderstand not, is holpen and supplied by the spirit him selfe, which requesteth for vs, and that with groanings which cannot be exprest: for it is not only the vnderstanding of the outward wordes, but principallie the inward affection of the hart, which both penetra- teth the heauens, and also the very hart of God him selfe in the time of prayer, with whom, as holy *Dauid* saith (psal. 18. 4.) *there are no languages, nor no speeches, whose voices are not heard with him.*

OUT

Our *first* prooffe, shall be taken from that of *S. Paul* 1. Cor. 14. the principall place which you so oft vrge againit vs, deducing from thence (pag. 188.) that *Prayer and Service in the vulgar tongue, was also together vsed in the best and first ages, according to the precept of the Apostles*; but we collect the contrary: thus *S. Paul* saying. *How shall he that occupieth the roome of the vnlearned, say Amen at the giuing thanks, seeing he vnderstandeth not what thou sayest?* shewes moit clearly, that such giuing of thanks, was not performed in the primitive Church, in the vulgar tongue: This we proue, because he requireth, or rather suppotheth, that in the Church Service of that very time there should be some other to supply the place of the *Idiot*; one who better vnderstood that tongue, then the *Idiot* did: which had the *Idiot* him selfe vnderstood, what needed any other to supply his place, which yet are the *Apostles* expresse words.

Our *first* prooffe shall bee, arguments drawn from the cleare and euident sayings of the Ancient Fathers, and first from that glorious light of the Latin Church, the great *S. Austen*, who in his booke of *Cathechising the ignorant* cap. 9. saith thus. *Nouerint etiam non esse vocem ad aures Dei. &c.* Let them likewise vnderstand, that it is not the voice, but the deuotion of the minde, that soundeth in the eares of God. For so they shall not laugh the Bishops and the Ministers of the Church to scorne, if perchance they shall perceiue them to call vpon God, other with barbarous and incongruous Latin, or else

not vnderstand the words they utter, and to distinguish them out of order. If I should repeat a thousand places, out of a thousand severall ancient Fathers, it were not possible to repeate a plainer then this of *S. Austen*, to proue that it was not thought in his dayes so necessarie a point of doctrine, that the publique seruice of the Church, should (to please the humor of the people) bee performed in a knownen vulgare tongue. For if the publique prayers of the Church had beene euery where vsed in the vulgar tongue, how should that case be euer heard of, or how should *S. Austen* suppose (vnlesse absurdly) that the Bishops them selues should speake barbarous Latin, or not perfectly vnderstand the selfe same words them selues pronounced in the open Church, vnlesse by supposing that some Bishops vnderstood not the comon language of their owne contrie? and yet hee saith in expresse tearmes in the same place. *Piè toleranda sunt*. These things are charitably to be borne with all. Thus *S. Austen*, who was not of the minde that all was presently mard, if the publique seruice were not said in in such a tongue, as euery man woman and child might vnderstand it, or that no tongue were to be admitted in the Church, besides the common tongue of euery contrie; But as there is a difference betwixt staring, and stark madde: so is there a discretion and moderation to bee vsed in this matter of tongues. And as this learned Father alloweth not that a Bishop should not vnderstand

the Latin tongue: so neither doth hee exclaime against the lack therof, that hee would presently haue the comon service of the Church published in euery prophane tongue, but the one to be arrêded, the other not altered: And to shew that the same fell not from this holy Fathers penne by chance, but that he was constant in this point of doctrine, I will shew you further what hee saith of this matter, as I finde the same laid downe in *M. Doctor Hardings answer to M. Iewels Challenge* pag. 96. thus then saith S. Austen. *Turbam, non intelligendi uinacitas sed credendi simplicitas, tutissimam facit.* cont. Manicheos epist. fund. cap. 4. As for the comon people, it is not the quicknesse of vnderstanding, but the simplicitie of beleeuing that maketh them (*Tutissimam* saith S. Austen) safest of all: a terrible touch to your *Via tuta* in this particular.

8. And yet further to shew, that euery where he was like himselfe, hee saith in another place, (ad Exod. epist. 102.) *Si propter eos solus mortuus est &c.* If Christ died only for them which can with certaine or sure vnderstanding discern these things, then is the labour wee take in the Church in a maner in vaine. God requireth not of vs how much we vnderstand, as how much we beleue, and thorough beleefe, how much we loue. And when we shall appeare before Christ in that dreadfull day of iudgment, we shall not be required to giue account of our vnderstanding, but faith, presupposed of our Charitie. Thus this learned Doctor vpon the

the words of *s. Austen*.

Our *seauenth prooffe* shall bee taken from testimonies of *Origen*, cited in the same chap. by *D. Harding* against *Iewell*. Prouing, that albeit the people vnderstand not the Latin tongue, yet because it consisteth in a maner wholly of the sacred Scripture, great and vnspeakable profit cometh both to the Reader, and to the Hearer of it. The words are taken out of *Origen* vpon *Iosue*, which thus the learned man abreuuiateth, for our better capacitie.

The *heauenly powers and Angells of God*, which bee with vs, haue great liking in our viterance of the words of the Scripture. Although we vnderstand not the words we viter with our mouth, yet those Powers vnderstand them, and that with delight, to helpe vs. And speaking of the Powers that be within vs, to whom the charge of our soules and bodies is committed, he saith. If the Scriptures be read of vs, they haue pleasure therein, and be made the stronger toward taking heede to vs: yea, and that, if we speake with tongues, and our spirit pray, and our sense be without fruit. Alleadging to that purpose, the comon place of *s. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, shewing how the spirit prayeth, the sense being without fruite. Lastly, shewing how by meate or drinke we finde a remedie for sore Eyes, though instantly we feele no benefit in eating or drinking, he concludeth thus. In this wise wee must beleue also of the holy Scripture, that it is profitable, and doth good to the soule, *Etiamsi sensus noster ad præsens*

intelligentiam non capit, *although for the present, our sense attaine not the vnderstanding.* Then, making an obiection against him selfe in the behalfe of his hearers, as though by this he would excuse him selfe from taking further paines, in preaching and expounding scriptures to them, thereto he answereth and saith thus. *No, no, we haue not said these to you for that cause, neither haue we vitered these things to you for excuse, but to shew you.* In scripturis sanctis esse vim quandam, quę legenti, etiam sine explanatione sufficiat, *that in the holy Scriptures there is a certaine strength, which is sufficient for one that readeth, yea without any expounding of it.* Now, what a comfort may simple Catholique people conceiue herein, to heare such graue and ancient Doctors of the Church, pronounce thus much in their defence against Protestants? I trust all wise, godly, and stedfast men, who be not carried into euery Crooked and vncoth Way, will be more moued with the authority of one *Austen*, or of one *Origen* (men in the iudgment of the Christian world, alwayes accounted most excellently learned) then with a hundred *Sir Humfrees*, coupled with as many *Caluins* & *Cassaders*.

After Scriptures and Fathers, our *Eight proofs* shall be drawn from sundry probable and powerfull *Reasons*, that so this vniuersall Custome may be consolidated on euery side. Wee say then 1. that the Latin tongue, although it be not a vulgar tongue, yet is it not an vnknownen tongue: but contrarywise a tongue which all

Chri-

Christian nations endeavour first to learne after their owne Mother tongue. Nor no Christian nation which vnderstandeth not, and that in very great numbers. Not so of the English, the which is barbarous & vnknownen to many nations where the Latin is comon.

We say 2. that very many, yea a great multitude of Latin wordes, are almost the same in sundry languages; and that the vulgar person who asisteth at Masse, and is attentue to the same, cannot choose but vnderstand whole hundreds in the same, as *Annunciatio, Incarnatio, Visitatio, Circumcisio, Adoratio, Flagellatio, Coronatio, Crucifixio, Eleuatio, Descensio, Ascensio*, which with manie more, are pure English, with the addition only of the letter N, at the end of each of them. Which being so, and no man aliue being able fruitfully to ponder at once, all the particular parts of the Latin, or the English Service, it sufficeth that the deuout soule vnderstanding but one only word of the *Introit* of the Masse, of the *Gloria in excelsis*, of the *Epistle, Gospell, Creed, Canon*, or any other part, may for that time pause thereon with great profit; and be said sufficiently both to heare and vnderstand the same to his soules profit; I say *Actually* to ponder one point alone, *Virtually*, all the rest. Dare you to deny this?

We say 3. that as there are *five senses* of nature in the body of man, so *two* of them (to wit, the *Eares* and the *Eyes*) are chiefly called, *sensus Doctrinae seu Disciplinae*, senses of doctrine or of discipline,

because by them we comonly come to vnderstand all kinde of Sciēces . Now the Church wisely and carefully, to accommodate her selfe to the condition of euery one , setteth forth the diuine seruice, partly by religious *Words* : partly by religious *Rites*. The wordes principally instruct the learned: the *Rites* and Ceremonies, the rudest and simplest man that may be. Now what skills it, or what bootes it, whether Denotion enter in by the *Eare*, or by the *Eye*, so it be in the soule at the time of diuine seruice ? Nay , if that which enters by the *Eye* alone , will not serue the turne without the *Eare*, then no deafe Protestant can euer fruitfully asist at diuine seruice.

We say 4. that not only the simple people, but many who thinke themselues some body in their owne conceit , vnderstand as litle of the sense of diuers Psalmes, Epistles, Gospells, and the like, recited in their vulgar tongue, then if they were read in Greeke or Latin : nor can tell no more what is ment by; *Thy kingdome come*, then they do by *Adueniat regnum tuum*: nor whether their prayer for their sick children, or any other necessity, pertaine to this part, or to, *Fiat voluntas tua* . It is enough therefore for them to know, that this holy prayer is appointed vs, to call vpon God in all our needes; more then this, is not necessary. Nay often times hearing them in the vulgar tongue, they may take them in a wrong and pernicious sense, which lightly they could not doe were the same said in Latin: as the Rhemes Testament hath learned

ned noted vpon this point.

We say 5. that one powerfull Reason to perswade that the Church of God hath with great prudence and wisedome ordayned this, is, because of the vncertaintie of all other comon tongues, in regard of their continuall variation; which experience teacheth to be so altered within the compasse of a few Ages, that enen the most expert in them, is hardly able to vnderstand the monuments of so smale Antiquitie. Contrary wherto, the Latin tongue in all ages hath bene still preserued in its owne puritie, as is cleare in the writings of Tullie, compared with those of this present day. Hence followeth, not only far more Reuerence, but incomparablie far more Certaintie in the preservation of all ould Ordinances touching diuine Service.

We say 6. that the Church of God hath with great wisedome ordained this so to auoide the incomoditie, or rather absurditie, which doth ensue of the contrary custome. For, an English merchant, or an English Minister, traueiling into a strang contry, and comming on a Sonday to a Church where Protestants are, whose language he vnderstands not, cannot ioine in prayer with them, and answer *Amen* to what is said, Nor can the Minister, though he carrie his Booke of Common Prayer with him, celebrate the English Service in any Protestant Church publicquely, and so should be hindred from the exercise of his function; yea, the same would sometimes happen, even

in the same contry, by reason of the diuersitie of Dialects. Where not to heare diuine Service vpon the Sondag, and other solemne dayes appointed by the Church, thorough our owne carelesnesse, hath euer bene accounted the breach of the Commandement, & a deadly or mortall sinne amongst Catholiques.

We say 7. that holy Church hath prudently ordayne this, so to auoide the *perill of changing the substance of the sacred wordes*. For were it permitted that euery nation should haue their Liturgie in their owne language, she should not be able to iudge of the differences which could arise about the great varietie of their Translations, nor could any particular nation be certaine he had a true translation of the Scriptures, wherof none can be certaine, but by the Churches approbation: nor would any one yeld to the other, should he be accused of corruption, still maintayning he vnderstood his owne language better then a stranger did. Such publique prayers therefore, are out of question kept more incorruptedly in their owne integritie, as your selues may see by plaine experience, would you but compare together the prayers of your English Church, with the innumerable different translations, which are to be found in other languages.

We say 8. that to put the publique service of the Church, into euery vulgar tongue, should be contrary to the practise of Christ and his Apostles. For, as touching Christ, he neuer commaunded the

the Iewes to translate the Scriptures out of the *Hebrue*, into the *Syriack* tongue: and yet in his time, the ancient *Hebrue*, was to the Iewes, as the *Latin* is at this day to the *English*, *French*, or *Italian*, and only the *Syriack* was in vse amongst them. As touching the Apostles, our aduersaries cannot deny, that euen in their dayes thorough out all the *East*, the publique prayers of the Church, were practised in the *Greeke* tongue, albeit there were then innumerable vulgar tongues amongst the people: as the like was in vie in the *West*, concerning the *Latin*. Nor is there any apparance or probabilitie, that euery contrie, did then turne the Scriptures, vsed to bee read in the publique Service of the Church, into their owne vulgar tongue: nor can any argument bee produced that so hath beene done: nor any copie, or exēplar extant in the whole world for a testimonie of this truth: *S. Peter* was in person in *England*; brought he with him, or left he behinde him, the Bible or Service in the same language?

We say 9. that they, who to maintaine their strange opinion of the vniuersall and publique Service of the Church, would haue the same in euery particular tongue and dialect, seeme to diminish the Maiestie, vilitie, and necessitie of the miraculous gift of tongues, which yet the holie Ghost himselfe gaue in the primitiue Church. For to what purpose should these serue, if euery one were to haue the Scriptures and diuine Service, in his owne dialect?

We

We say 10. that the bad effects and fruits which follow of putting the Bible and publique liturgie of the Church in to euery vulgar tongue, were alone sufficient to decline it; for it hath bene the occasion of many hereticall and damnable opinions amongst the vnlearned & common people yea, we see, whereſoeuer this practise hath put foote, it hath left the ground embrued with much naughtinesse: bringing in to euery cōmon wealth for the puritie of the Gospell, most foule enormities: for peace and mutuall loue, implacable dissension: for obedience to Church and Pastors, pride of iudgment: for religion, blasphemous railing; and inſteed of good order, licentious living. In so much that in Germanie, some would haue committed incest with their owne daughters, others held it lawfull to lie with their mayd-servants, because they read in their vulgar Bibles, that some of the Patriarks them selues did so.

I say 11. If this doctrine of hauing the publique liturgie of the Church in euery language, were the receiued practicall doctrine of the primitive Church? If that faith and doctrine which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages? if doctrine and practise goe together (as needes they must?) then shew me but one lyturgie, one seruice booke only agreeing with yours, e he in French, Italian, or Dutch, in any language vnder heaven, for fiftene hundred yeares before Luther, and for that one memorable Monument take, I will neuer goe to Masse more.

But

But this we must expect, that you performe, the same day that you shew vs; *Where was your Church before Luther?* Or if you can not performe this, the let the world iudge, how miserable a man you are, & how palpably you seeke to deceiue, to pretend *the precepts of the Apostle*, and the *practise of the primitive Church*, hauing nether the one, nor the other for your warrant?

Sir Humfrey pag. 195.

But it is to be lamented, that poore ignorant soules should be captiuated with such fillic Reasons, and that faithfull beleeuers should be accursed for heretiques, for following of the Apostles, and the primitive Church, euen by the testimonies of the best learned amongst themselves. Since therefore Prayer and Service in an vnknown tongue, wants antiquitie from the written word, or rather since it is forbidden by the word of the Apostle, *S. Austens* profession shall be my confession. *If we, or an Angell from heauen preach vnto you any thing (touching prayer in a known tongue) besides that you haue receiued in the legall and euangelicall Scriptures, let him be accursed.*

A N S W E R.

True, it is indeed *to be lamented*, that poore ignorant soules should be captiuated with such silly deceits as these of yours. As for *Reasons*, you haue brought none worth a Rush to disproue our practise. You haue had here many from vs, I could haue

haue brought you many more if neede had ben
 but we shall long to see what such a man of *Reason*
 as your selfe, will first say against these reasons
 Your assertion your vaine and emptie affirmati
 that *Prayer and Seruice in an vnknown tongue* *Want*
Antiquity from the Written Word, or rather is *forbid*
den by the Word of the Apostle, and yet bring no on
 Text, no one line, nor no one expresse passag
 to proue the contrary, be vrays indeed the gre
 want you haue of holy scripture, the great *Want*
 you haue of *Antiquitie from the Written Word*; which
 to supply, you fall a telling of vntruths intollerab
 ble, a fault expressely forbidden by the Word of the A
 postle Ephes. 4. 25. saying. *For which cause layin*
away lying, speake yee truth euery one with his neigh
bour; And that of the same Apostle Colos. 3. 9
 saying. *Lie not one to another*: this indeed is much
 to be lamented in you. We haue proued that we
 haue *antiquitie from the Written Word*. We haue like
 wise produced this our practise both from *Origen*
 and *S. Austen*, wherto I remit you, and could cite
 you twenty more, would I be tedious, but I desire
 first to see how you will deale with the necks of
 these; I shall much wonder, if by shifts and cauill
 you turne not the necks of them both cleane about, so
 to wrest them to your owne side, which if you doe
 then must I warne you in your owne wordes, be
 ware of their example who could not beleue; or if they
 did beleue, durst not cōfesse Christ because they sought
 the praise of men more then the praise of God. pag. 42.

Astor *S. Austens Profession*, to be your conclu-

sion.

tion, viz. If an Angell from heauen, preach vnto you any thing besides that you haue receiued, is most impertinently applied by you against Prayer in an vnknown tongue, For, did not S. Austen him selfe being borne in Africke, saie Masse in the Latin tongue? Or did all the Affricans speake and vnderstand the Latin? Lord haue mercie vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs, how plainlie, how notoriouslie you seeke to deceiue, and yet performe the same to palpable! Proue vnto me, either that S. Austen, once only in his whole life, said Masse in his Mother tongue; or, that the vulgar people of Affrica where he liued, dyed, and vnuallie celebrated, vnderstood the Latin tongue (wherin yet S. Austen said Masse vnto them) and repute me for the impudents liar, that euer could tale in his vulgar tongue, or (which is the least I can say) you to haue most deceitfully and most impertinently applyed this saying of S. Austen, against prayer in an vnknown tongue. This indeed is a thing very much to be lamented. This was neither the profession, nor conclusion of S. Austen. Who contrarywise concluded thus. To dispute against that which is admitted by the whole Church, is most insolent madnesse. But the vniuersall Church admits the publique Seruice in the Latin tongue; Therefore to dispute against it is most insolent madnesse.

3. But why spend I my breath in vaine to dispute with you about these particulars? We are to speake, we are to dispute, but one point alone.

Where

Where was your Church before Luther. This, you have vndertaken to make the World to know. This you tell vs is no difficult matter for a meane layman to doe. This, you confesse to be the chiefe state of the question, and the Iesuits Challenge. This, you haue promised to performe to vindicate your Masters cause, and your owne reputation. To meet your Aduersary vpon his owne ground. To deale with him at his owne Weapons, by giuing him a Catalogue of Names of visible Protestant professors in all Ages, especially in those before Luther. This being so, we still cry to you, we still call to you as we did before, your Catalogue Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, sith your selfe cōfesses it to be an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all ages (Epist Ded. pag. 3.) Sith your sole Rule of Scripture also assureth vs And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors to the cōsummation of the Saints, vnto the work of the Ministrie, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ vntill we meete all into the vnitie of faith, and knowledge of the Sōne of God into a perfect man. Eph. 4. 11

This is that, Sir Humfrey, which is exacted of you. This, and only this, is the thing you are to performe. *Generationem eius quis enarrabit?* psal. 33. 8. When will you once shew vs this generation? And becaule Bishops haue euer had the principal place in the Church of God, because God himselfe hath put them there to Gouverne his Church,

when

when will you Repeate vnto vs as *Tertullian* teacheth you (*Prescript. cap. 32.*) the beginning of your Churches? Vnsould the orders of your Bishops? Giue vs a Catalogue of their names, saying. Our present Archbishop Doctor Abbot, succeeded *Banckroft*, *Banckroft*, succeeded *Whitegift*, *Whitegift* succeeded *Cranmer*, and so of the rest; And then tell him plainly to his teeth; this lo is the generation that you haue to long looked for, our first Bishop, who had for his first author and predecessor, some one of the Apostles, or Apostolicall men, which liued in the Apostles time. Then may you boldly say, that you haue stoppt the mouth of all Papists, and haue indeed vindicated your Mothers cause, and your owne reputation.

To close vp therfore this discourse touching Seruice in an vnknown tongue, the Authors wherof you haue serued your selfe to proue your purpose, are 1. *Haymo*. 2. *Iustinian* Emperor. 3. *Gregory* Pope. 4. *Cyra*. 5. *Ioannes Beletius*. 6. *Grezerus* leuit. 7. Doctor *Harding*. 8. *Cassander*. 9. *Waldensis* a Carmelit, 10. *Aquinas*. a friar. 11. *Bellarmin* leuit. 12. Pope *Honorius*. 13. The Councel of *Trent* (expressly called to condemne your heresie) and and *Erasmus*, all in number fourteene, wherof seauē of them liued since *Luthers* dayes; which how, I pray, makes it good your vndertaking, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages? Or how can seauen witnesses, serue to proue the perpetuall practise of this point for whole fifteene or sixteene hundred

hundred yeares? Or how are Popes, Friars, Carmelites and Iesuits, sound, orthodox, and visible Protestants? How many Ages were betwixt Haymo and Iustinian? How many Ages betwixt Pope Gregorie and Beletbus? What long leapes fetch you without a staffe, to prove your purpose, which as I haue often told you should be orderly, successinely, lineally, interruptedly continually, and distinct from ours, so that as it were with sixteene hands, the first and neereſt vnto vs, houlding the second by the hand, he the third, and so in order, we may come at last to him who holdeth hands with Christ him selfe and his Apostles, there laying downe our faith frō whence we first receiued the same. Vntill you do this, all your labour is meerly lost. Vntill you do this, neuer imagine that ether Protestants consciences can be satisfied, nor Papists moutnes be euer stopped, to vige you to shew, *Where was your Church before Luther?* And now to put on to you 8. Paragraph, which is of Images. Wherin we shall see if you make a better Image, and truer picture of a Protestant in that parag: then you haue done in the former, which hitherto hath bene very vnſightlie and deformed.

Parag. VIII.

Worship of Images.

IT is the ninth Article of the Roman Creed.
 I do resolutely affirme, that the Images of Christ,
 and

and of the Virgin Marie, and also of other Saints, are to be had and retayned; and that due honor and veneration, is to be yelded to them. This Article was decreed in the 25. Session of the Councell of Trent, where it was declared; We teache, that the Images of Christ, the Virgine Mother of God, and other Saints, are chiefly in Churches to be had and retayned, and that due honor and worship is to be giuen vnto them.

This doctrine of Image worship we absolutely deny, and condemne as a wicked and blasphemous opinion. First, because this Article of faith doth not only want (65. Vntrus.) the authoritie of the Scripture (which an Article of faith ought to haue) but because the Scripture doth flatly & plainly forbid it.

A N S W E R.

This Article of Image worship, was by your owne cōfession, decreed by the Councell of Trent, and many hundred yeares before that, by the Councell of Nice, what say you to the decrees of these two Councils? You say, *this doctrine we absolutely deny, and condemne as a wicked and blasphemous opinion.* But who I pray, are you, to deny and condemne as wicked and blasphemous, the decree of the vniuersall Church? the decree of two such famous Councils? Who is Sir Humfrey or his Church, cōpared to ether of these two Councils? What is a mite, what is a mote, compared to so great a Mountaine? By what warrant, or by what authoritie from the word of God, do

you this? Again, when this so wicked and blasphemous doctrine was first broached, when the *Nicen* Councell (nine hundred yeares since) accursed all such as defended that heresie, when *St. Iohn Damascen* wrote three bookes Apologetical against the impugnors of holy Images, where pray, lay your troupe of Reformed bretheren fast asleepe? In what hole did they hide their heads that they appeared not to oppose them selves against this wicked and damnable doctrine? Where were your visible professors? Where were your watchfull pastors, that stood then for the defence of the Reformed gospel, and for the flock of Christ, to keepe them from the cruell Wolves? Many Nations were now conuerted; many Kingdomes were now Christian; many Councells had now beene called, as well before, as since that Councell: Where was that Generall or Prouinciall Councell of *your* calling, that did oppose this of *ours*? Who summoned it? What were the Acts? Where was it held vnder heauen? Were they imbreasted in our bosome? or lay they so fast asleepe therein, that the clamors and cries of so great a Councell could not awake them, euen then assembled to accurse them? If, I say, they were in our bosome, why awaked they not? why slept they not out? why spake they not? why defended they not their cause? why cryed they not out against that Councell? What drouisie Reformers, what deafe Hyrelings, what carelesse Keepers of the flock of Christ? Doth not our Sauour

Christ

Christ in the gospell say. If these should hold their peace, the very stones themselves would crye? What stone of yours once stird, or once cryed out vpon this occasion? Christ him selfe, who euer heard of such a Chymera? Who euer heard tell of such a tale of a Tub! Or of such a cosoning *Via Tuta*!

Sir Humfrey pag. 298.

If wee looke vpon the old law, before the coming of Christ, *Vasques* the Iesuit confesseth, So far forth every Image was forbidden, as it was dedicated to adoration; therefore neither the Cherubins, nor any other Images, had any worship in the Temple. And *Cornelius Agrippa* tells vs, the Iewes did abhorre nothing more then Images: neither did they make any Image that they worshipped; In so much that when *Caligula* the Emperor was desirous to haue his owne Image set vp in the Church of Hierusalem, King *Agrippa*, makes him this answer. This Temple, *o Caligula*, from the first beginning to this time, neuer yet admitted any Image, being the house of God; For the works of painters and Caruers, are the Images of materiall Gods, but to paint the inuisible God, or to frame a representation of him, our ancestors did account it a wickednes. And that is more to bee lamented, the worship of Images at this day, is such a stumbling block to the Iewes, and an hindrance to their conuersion, that when they come to the Christians sermons (as in Rome they are enioyned once at least every yeare) so

long at least as they see the preacher direct his
speeche and prayer to a litle wodden Crucifix
&c

A N S W E R.

To that of *Vasques* I answer *first*, that what Images the Iewes dedicated to adoration, they often adored them as Idols; and therefore no maruell though they were forbidden them to auoide that danger: but that danger ceasing now amongst vs (who can worship Images, and yet not make Idols of them) Image worship may be vsed.

I say *secondly*, King *Agrippa*, had great reason to deny the setting vp of *Caligulas* owne Image in the Temple of God; both for that hee was an Idolater, and for that hee intended to haue him selfe adored there for a God. Can you accuse vs to do this?

I say *thirdly*, that touching the Iewes, it redounds litle to your credit, to defend their quarrell. They hate indeed the picture of Christ, because they cannot abide Christ him selfe, nor to see the forme or patterne of that, wheron their Fathers put him to death. Will you ioyne with the Iewes herein? Again, you can abide no such pictures, you haue no such Crucifixes in your handes when you preach; How many Iewes or Turkes haue you turned to you by this contrary practise? If this reason were any reason; the Worship of Images, is a stumbling block to the Iewes, therefore better to be forbidden; this also should bee good; the Baptisme of Christians in the name of

Iesus,

Iesus, all the new Testament which containes his life and death, is hatefull to them, and a stumbling block to their conuersion, therefore away with the one, & burne the other. See you not what poore stufte you produce againt vs? Lord how palpable you seeke to deceiue!

I lay fourthly, an Image, representing our B. Sauiour, drawen by *Nicodemus* his Disciple, being after found out by the Iewes, was crucified by them in despite of Christ, dealing with the picture, as their forefathers had done by Christ himselfe: out of which Image, issued much blood miraculously, to their great amazement and confusion. This historie wee haue in the workes of *S. Athanasius*, and approued aboue 900. yeares past, in the tenth Oecumenicall Councell kept at Nice, *actiōe quarta* the same man who made the Creed which your selues publicly singe in your booke of Common prayer. He that desires to see more of this kinde, let him reade Doctor *Sandets* Treatise of Images, Doctor *Stapletons* Counterblast lib. 4. pag. 396. Where he shall finde many examples, both of the worship, and of the miracles wrought by pictures. But here God blesse the Fathers necks, and keepe them well from *Sir Humfries* wrinche.

Sir Humfrey pag. 200.

It is agreed therefore on both sides, that in the old law, the Iewes neuer allowed adoration of Images, for almost 4000. yeares. And this was

concerning the Images of God the Father. Now let vs descend from the law, to the New Testament, and see what order was taken by Christ and his Apostles, for the representation of him and his Saints after him. It is manifest and without question, that the law of God made against Images, is a Morall law, and stands in force at this day against Iewes and Gentills. And although *Perezius*, and *Catharinus*, and *Vasques* the Iesuit, would vnderstand the law against Images to bee a positive and ceremoniall law, and therefore to cease at the entrance of the gospell, yet *Bellarmino* disauowes that construction, with a *Non probatur*. This opinion is not allowed of vs, both for the reasons made against the Iewes, and for that *Ireneus*, *Tertulian*, *Cyprian*, and *Austen* do all teache, that the Commandments, excepting the Sabbath, are a law naturall and morall. If therefore the old Commandment be not abrogated, let vs see what example or precept there is in the gospell for adoration. *M. Fisher* the Iesuit tells vs, In the Scripture there is no expresse practise, nor precept of worshipping the Image of Christ, yet there be principles which (the light of nature supposed) conuince adoration to bee lawfull. So that from the law of God, and the law of grace, wee are at last returned to the law of Nature, and from the light of Nature, an article of faith must bee declared.

A N S W E R.

Not from the light of Nature only, but from the light of Nature, illuminated with the law of God,

God, and the law of grace; yea, had we no other precept or plainer prooffe, then that precept of **Christe, Heare the Church**, that alone might suffice for a prooffe from Scripture, and for a warrant of our worship. But touching the two-fold opinion, whither it bee a *Morall*, or *Ceremoniall* law, I thus distinguish the state of the question. In as much as it forbiddeth the making of euill Images to adore them, as though some Diuinitie did inhabit in them, it is a *Naturall* and *Morall* law, and bindeth euer, both then, and now, both them, and vs: this we deny not. But in as much as God him selfe commaunded the making and setting vp of the brazen Serpent, in this respect it appeares to bee only a *Ceremoniall* or *Positiue* law. The reason is, because looke what *Morall* law God once decreed, wee reade not in all Scripture, that hee him selfe did euer after repeale the same, but after God had made that law against the making of Images, him selfe ordayned the making of the brazen Serpent: ergo it was not a *Naturall* and *Morall*, but a *Positiue* and *Ceremoniall* law: in a word *Temporarie*, and to bee no longer in vse, then the continuation of the *abuse*.

I say *secondly*, that Protestants who admit nothing but *sole Scripture* for the Rule of their Religion, should proue vnto vs out of this Rule, that it is manifest and without question, that this Law against Images, is a *Naturall* and *Morall* law, and therefore stands in force at this day, rather then that of the Sabbath, or Saturday, which yet

themselues, with vs, haue changed into Sunday, and confesse to be a Positiue & Ceremoniall law. If the one were *Naturall, Morall*, standing in force and binding for euer, why not the other? If that were *Positiue, Ceremoniall*, and binding only for a time, why not this?

I say *thirdly*, that touching *S. Austen*, I haue already proued at large, be it that he with other Fathers taught, that all the Commandements . excepting the Sabbath, are a law *Naturall and Morall*, yet he neuer held, yea in expresse tearmes he teacheth this to be no distinct commaundement as Protestants do, but only a more ample explication of the former; *Thou shalt haue no other Gods before me*: as is to be seene pag. 190. wherto I remit you, because it quite crosseth and dasheth, what you bring against this doctrine.

Sir Humfrey pag. 202.

I haue read of *Varro*, an heathen Philosopher, who from the instinct of Nature, professed the contrary doctrine. *The Gods (saith hee) are better serued without Images*. And *S. Austen* conceiues this Tenet of his to be so good a principle in Nature, that he condescends to his opinion, and testifies thus much in his behalfe; *Although Varro attained not to the knowledge of the true God, yet how nere he came to the truth in this saying, Who doth not see?* Now the reason why these Fathers condemned the worshippers of Images for heretiques and Idolaters (66. *vntruth*) is rendred by *Eusebius*. Be-

cause

cause (saith he) the men of ould, of a heathenish custom, were wont after that maner, to honor such as they counted Saviours; and therupon, after that Images had got footing among the Christians, the Bishops and Emperors, by Councells and commands, tooke speciall care to preuent them, both in the making (67. vnt ruth) and the worshiping. The Councell of Eliberis in Granada in Spaine, decreed, that no pictures should be in Churches, lest that which was worshipped, should be painted on the walles. And the Emperors Valens and Theodosius, made proclamation to all Christians, against the Images of Christ (68. vnt ruth) in this maner. For as much as we haue a diligent care in all thinges, to maintaine the religion of the most high God, therefore we suffer no man to fashion, to graue or paint the Image of our Saviour, ether in colours, or in stone, or in any other kinde of mettall, or matter: but whersoeuer any such Image shall be found, we command it to be taken downe, assuring our subiects, that we will most strictly punish all such as shall presume to attempt any thing contrary to our decree and commandment.

A N S W E R.

I To that of S. Austen touching Varro, I passe it ouer, because you point vs not where to finde it. I say therefore first, that the Fathers condemned the worshippers of Images for heretiques and Idolaters, is directly false. If therefore you will not stop their breaths, heare them tell their owne tales, and first S. Austen, who vpon occasion of certaine Pagans

Pagans deuised forgeries, against *Christ*, *S. Peter* and *Paul*, coniecturing why they rather named these, then any other, saith thus. *I thinke it was, because they had seene in many places, them pictured together with Christ.* Tom. 4. de contentu Euang. lib. 1. cap. 10.

2. And that *S. Austen* held, both the making, and worship of Images to be lawfull, he clearly and confessedly teacheth, that *The honor giuen vnto profitable signes appointed by God, passeth from them to the thing signified.* Tom. 2. de doct. *Christ.* lib. 3. cap. 9. cited in *S. Austen Religion* pag. 169. 171. Now how for Gods sake, could he euer say this of the picture of *Christ*, of *S. Peter* and *Paul*, had they not bene to be seene in many places? How could he speake thus of pictures, that the honor giue to the signe, passeth from it to the thing signified, if he had euer held the Worshipers of those Images, ether for heretiques or Idolaters? How could he, being a Bishop, and Bishops forbidding both the making and worshipping of Images, euer speake thus honorably of them?

3. To that of *Eusebius*, I say *thirdly*, how should he condemne worshippers of Images for heretikes and Idolaters, when he relating the historie of the woman healed in the gospell, by touching the hemme of our Saviours garment saith, that she set vp an Image of *Christ* in memorie of this benefit which did many miracles. And *Iulian* the Apostata throwing it afterwards downe (as heretiques do his Image now) and setting vp his owne
in

in steed thereof, it was immediatly destroyed by fire from heauen: and the Image of Christ, broken by the heathens, the peeces therof was afterwards gathered together by the Christians, and placed in the Church, where it remayned as *Sozomenus* writeth, to his time. See *Rhe, Test. annot. pag. 24.* Now, had this bene Idolatrie, how would God haue permitted miracles to haue bene wrought at that holy picture? Had it beene Idolatrie, how would the people of that time haue gathered vp the broken peeces, and set them againe together? Do Protestants, who pretend to reduce all things to those pure and primitiue times, euer practise the like pietie towards pictures? Had it bene heresie or Idolatrie, how would the Bishops of that time haue euer suffered such impietie, as to set the same vp in the Church? Lastly, had it bene Idolatrie, how did not God him selfe reuenge his owne cause, and destroy the same with fire from heauen, as he did that other of *Iulian* the Apostata? All these thinges, *Sir Humfrey* be hard and terrible things for you to answer. God bleesse *S. Austen*, God bleesse *Eusebius*, and *Sozomenus* necks, that you giue them not the wrinche, whensoever you goe about to walke your handes of so euident testimonies.

4. To that of *Eliberis* in Spaine, I say fourthly, that it is so far from making against vs, that it maketh much for vs. For that prohibition of painting pictures on the walles, seemeth to presuppose the allowance of their paintings in other places, wherefore

fore else doth the Councell say? *Least that which was worshipped, should be painted on the Walles.* in which wordes the whole Emphasis doth consist. For had that Councell held the Worship of Images for Idolatry, absolutely, nether would it haue said, *least that which is worshiped &c.* much lesse haue named the *painting on Walles* in particular, but haue forbid the painting *in, or on,* any other place whatsoener, as wel in Churches, as on walles. Yea, the troublefome state of that age well considered, and held in time of persecution, had good reason for their doings, least the Christians (compelled to fly in that troublefome time, and leauing their Images on the walles) they might be abused, mocked, and scorned by the painims in their absence. And yea we our selues would both decree and do as much at this day for to saue our Images from the hands of hereticks.

5. To that of *Valens & Theodosius*, I answer *Fistlie*, that you abuse them, and seeke to deceiue notoriously; for their decree was not against the *Images of Christ*, but in fauor of them, to wit, lest the sauing signe of our Redemption, should be trodden vnder foote: & therefore ordained that where the signe of the Crosse was graued on the ground it should, for reuerence, be *taken vp*, not *taken downe*, as you translate, most decentfully. Looke but into *Thomasius* Dictionarie, and he will tell you, that the primarie signification of *Tollo*, is to *hise*, or *set vp*, to *take vp*, or *hoiste vp*. For I pray, when the wicked Iewes cryed out against our Sauiour

nious saying, *Tolle, tolle, crucifige eum*, cryed they to haue Christ taken downe from the Crosse? When a Master meaning to whip a boy for his fault, saith to another. *Tolle eum*; intenderh he that the other should take him downe? If you were a boy, and went to schoole againe, you surely deserued to be soundly whipt, for turning *Tolli*, so deceitfully. For those good Emperours were far from the minde of *taking downe*, or destroying the picture of Christ, or of his Crosse, which they would haue worne also in the Crownes of Kings and Emperours, as it is at this day thorough out all Christendome. This indeed is to turne the neckes of the Fathers quite about, to make them serue your owne turne: for shame of God & the world, cease to vse this wicked custome.

Sir Humfrey pag. 205.

I forbear to cite the particular Fathers, that opposed, and condemned the Worship of Images in the primitive Church. It may suffice that this doctrine wats foundatiō in the Scriptures, by their owne confession. And now it shall appeare, that they want also the visibilliry of the anciēt Church and the testimonies of the holie Fathers (69. *truth*) by the like acknowledgment of the learned Romanists amongst them selues.

And then you name. *Agobardus, Hincmarus, Cas-*
sander, an heretique. *Peregrinus, Nicholas Clemangis*
(another heretique) *Polidor Virgil, Erasmus, Cor-*
nelius, the Coniurer, *Wicelius* (suspected) and the

condemned Councell of *Francfort*. Some of them heretiques; al obscure for authority; many of them since *Luthers* daies. Who hath euer heard the name and fame of these eccho in our English pulpits, like to these which now I shall name you?

A N S W E R.

1. To shew therefore *first* this to be most false, that the *Fathers of the primitive Church* (whereof you haue not here named one) *opposed and condemned the worship of Images*, and that this doctrine, *wants the visibility of the Ancient Church*: let these ensuing testimonies trie it out betwixt vs two.

2. *S. Basil* in his sermon of *S. Barlaam* Martyr, shewing how his torments were more liuely expressed by the painter in the Church, thē he could set them out with all his eloquence, saith thus. *I shall goe my waye ouercome by the Image which you haue set vp of the combat and victories of the Martyr, and shall reioyce that I am by your dexteritie so surmounted &c.* And then admiring the art, and the martirs torments, he saith further. *Let Christ, the great Master of the combat, be also painted in the same table.* In orat. *S. Barl.*

3. *S. Gregorie* of Nice, brother to *S. Basil*, relates the like of the *B. Martyr Theodorus*, where speaking of the magnificence and stately building of the Church, besides much more, he saith thus. *Where the painter hath set the flowers of his art, representing in an Image here, the valiant deedes of the Martyrs torments; there the barbarous frowning countenance*

tenance of the tyrants, their violent assaults, the flaming fornice, the most happie end of this Champion, the forme of Christ in his humanitie, President of the combat. All these things he drawing in colours curiouslie, as it were in a certaine booke that containeth interpretation of tongues, hath expressed vnto vs, the combats of martyrs as a pleasant and flourishing meadow, and hath therewith beautified our Church: for the picture drawn in the walle, is wont to speake, and to profit exceeding much.

4. That our Saviours picture was vsually standing in the Church in S. Chrysostomes dayes, may be gathered out of this Ceremonie which is commaunded in his Liturgie or Masse, translated by Erasmus (euen the man whom you call to witnesse about this matter.) The priest goeth out of the little doore of the Reuestrie bearing with him, the gospell or Masse booke; the Minister that was to serue him, going before with a light: and turning towards the Image of God, that was between the Reuestrie and the Chancelldore, bowing his head to it, doth say aloud such a prayer.

5. With S. Chrysostome, I will put his worthy schollar Nilus, a very ancient and religious Abbot, who flourished in Constantinople, anno Domini 410. He in his Epistle to the Proconsull Olympiodorus, writeth thus, I would haue the Wallles of the Church, to be filled vp with the histories of the old and new Testament, by the hand of a most skilfull painter, to the end that, the vnlearned who cannot reade the holy Scripture, may, by behoulding the pictures, be brought in remembrance, who haue sincerely and constantly

standlie by valiant deedes, serued the one true, God, and be therby stirred vp to vndertake the like glorious and virtuous conflicts, by which the others exchanged earth for heauen, in contemplation worshipping these things which they had not seene.

All these are found together in Doctor Bishops answer to M. Perkins, and Doctor Abbot, in his tract of Images pag. 669. &c. with many moe most cleare and euident testimonies of antiquitie, both for the making and worship of Images, as that of the Emperors *Constantine* and *Valentinian*, that of *Prudentius*, of *S. Paulinus*, and of *S. Gregorie* the great: all which speake as contrarie to *Sir Humfrey*, as if they particularly employed their penes against this his *Via Tuta*. *S. Basil* confesseth the making of them, admireth it, commendeth it, commandeth the setting vp in Churches, *S. Gregorie* of Nice saith, that it beautified the Church: that the Picture drawn on the wall, is wont to speake (after a silent maner) and to profit exceeding much. *S. Chrysostome*, bowed his head to the Image, and made aloud prayer. *Nilus* his scholler, would haue the walles of the Church to bee filled with the histories of the old and new Testament, to instruct the vnderstanding of the vnlearned, who had not seene the thinges themselves with their owne eyes: and yet *Sir Humfrey* would make the world beleue (but most deceitfully) that the ancient Fathers, opposed and condemned the worship of Images in the primitive Church: that this doctrine wanted the visibilitie of

tie of the ancient Church, and the testimonies of holy Fathers. Lord how may we beleue such a man in any thing he saith! Lord what comparison betwixt thele men, and *Cassander*, *Peregrinus*, *Polydor Virgil*, *Erasmus*, *Cornelius Agrippa* (accused for a Coniurer) ether for sanctitie or antiquitie! Or which of them was ever stiled, or ever dignified with the title of a Saint! Which being so, I will spend no more time about the examination of the rest of this Paragraph.

6. But for as much as *Sir Humfrey* denyeth as lawfull, ether the making or setting vp of Images, yea that it seemeth contrary to the word of God, and almost to the instinct of nature, hauing said somewhat from other mens mouths. I will say somewhat from myne owne, to see if by any meanes possible, we can beate this point of Images into Protestants braines. For my part, ever since I knew what Catholique Religion ment, I was of the minde, and am to this present, that it is one of the most absurdest and senseles opinions, that any Protestant doth defend: yea so contrary to sense and comon reason, that supposing wee breake the Commandment, or bee Idolaters, for making and worshipping the picture of Christ, all Protestants are bound, neuer to pray, neuer to heare sermon, neuer to thinke of IESVS Christ. yea, if but the very thought of any part of his life passio or death, should but enter into his hart, that hee is bound to fly it and detest it, as hee would do some sinfull temptation of the diuell. Words are nothing,

lets come to prooffe.

7. The first ground and principle which I will insist vpon to proue my purpose, shall bee, to distinguish the Ten Commandments into two, to wit, into *Negative*, and *Affirmative*. For example, *Remember thou keepe holy the Sabbath day. Honor, thy Father and Mother*: these Two are both *Affirmative*. The other Eight (diuiding them as Protestants doe) are all *negative*, as appeareth by the words them selues. *Thou shalt not comit adultrie. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steale &c.* The *Affirmative*, teach vs what we are to do. The *Negative* tell vs, what we are to forbear and leaue vndone. All this, I hope no reasonable man, in comon sence, ether will, or can deny.

8. Vpon this *First* Foundation, I build this *second*. Euery *Negative* Commandment, for biddeth two seuerall things. The one, the *outward*, or *externall* Act. The other, the *internall*, or *inward* thought. For example, that Commandmēt which *Negatiuely* saith, *Thou shalt not kill*, not only forbiddeth to kill with sword, Pistoll, Poyniard, or the like, but not with full consent to desire anothers death: if I do, I haue broken this Commandment, as if I had done the deede actually. This appeareth clearly by the 7. Commandment, *Thou shalt not commit Adultrie*: wherof our Sauour speaking in *S. Mattheu*, saith thus. *It was said to them of old, Thou shalt not commit adulterie, but I say to you, that who so euer shall see a woman to lust after her, hath already committed aduoutrie with her, in his hart.*

hart (Mat. 5. 28.) Can any Christian deny this?

9. Vpon this *second*, I build this *third*. If euery *Negative* Commandment forbid two seuerall thinges, to wit, as well the *internall thought*, as the *externall act*, this Commandment (in Protestants account) *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any graven Image, nor the likenesse of any thing that is in heauen above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water vnder the earth*, being a *Negative* Commandment, must needes be of the nature of all the rest: must needes forbid two seuerall things: must needes forbid, as well the *internall thought*, as it doth the *externall act*. Whence followeth, that if wee breake the same, if wee be Idolaters, for making the Image or likenesse of Christ *outwardly*, they must needes breake the same, they must needes bee Idolaters, for making the likenesse of him *inwardly*: and consequētly are bound neuer to pray, neuer to heare sermon, neuer to thinke of *Iesus Christ*, neuer to meditate of any part, ether of his *Passion*, life or death: which how can he possibly do, but by making his picture?

8. For example, he who by the meanes of prayer, or by hearing a sermon, would at Christmas call to mind that ioyfull mylterie of Christs *Natiuitie*, and on Goodfriday that sorrowfull part of his *passion*, how shall the one or the other, enter first into his hart? He must ether haue the sight of a picture, so to conueigh it *inwardly* by the *Eye*, or the helpe of a sermon, so to conueigh it *inwardly* by the *Eare*, becaute, according to the receiued

Axiome. *Nihil est in intellectu, quin prius sit in sensu.*
Nothing is in the vnderstanding, vnlesse it bee first in the sense. Some *ourward* species or forme, must necessarily concurre to helpe, instruct, and conueigh it to the vnderstanding *inwardly*, which is meerely blind and can see nothing, without looking in to the glasse of some sensible and *ourward* creature. Which being so, how absurd is it for any Protestant, euen in *naturall Reason*, to deny the making of pictures, which hee cannot deny, but hee must deny a facultie of his owne soule? Which hee cannot deny, but hee must deny the light of Nature? And which he cannot deny, but he must needes be said to breake the Commandment, or fly the very thought of Christ, as he would do the temptation of the diuell? And because if *Sir Humfrey* please to reply, hee may haue the same summed vp in shorter words, the whole substance of this discourse, may briefly be reduced in forme, as thus. Every Negative Commandemēt, forbiddeth two seuerall things, as well the inward, as the outward act. But the second Commandment, forbiddeth Papists the making of Images outwardly. Ergo it forbiddeth Protestāts the making of the inwardly. Ergo by this Commandment, Protestants, are forbidden, euer to haue the Image of Christ their Saviour in their harts. Or if this seeme to bee most absurd (as indeed it is) if they may make the picture of Christ *inwardly*, without the breache of this Commandment, then let them likewise iudge charitablie of vs, that wee may do
the

the like *outwardly*, without any breach of the same Commandment.

10. But some (not so peruerse as *Sir Humfrey*) will perhaps here say, that they do not think the Commandment expressely to forbid the *making* of Images, but only their worship or *adoring*. To these, more reasonable and more moderate men, I make this answer, that if we cleaue to the strict words of the Commandment, it as well forbiddeth the *making*, as the *adoring*, yea this first, before that. For, as if his Maiestie should command vpon paine of death, that no man should make swords, weare swords, or strike with swords, hee should as well break the Commandment and deserue death, that should make them, as hee that should ether weare them, or do some mischief with them, euen so (setting aside the sence, and the practise of the whole Church) the case is the same in this Commandment, which in words, as expressely and as strictly, forbiddeth the *making*, as it doth the *adoring*.

11. That shift or shelter therefore, being taken from them, and that aforesaid supposed which I haue already proued, to wit, that every Negative Commandment forbiddeth two seuerall things: as well the *inward thought* as the *outward act*, I see not but by the same reason that their *making* is proued lawfull, adoration also, at, or before them, may bee proued lawfull. For when a Protestant, without the helpe of any outward picture, hath conceiued Christ in his hart, now newly Borne,

now *Circumcised*, now *Baptised*, now *Crucified*, and the like, ether hee adioyneth therto an act of adoration, or he doth not. If hee doth not, when then doth he adore? If hee doth, why may hee adioyne an act of adoration with the one, and not we with the other? Why he with the inward, not we with the outward? Why he by the helpe of the one, and not wee by the helpe of the other? For nothing is given to the one or to the other for it ielfe, but for the *Relation* the picture hath to the to the truth which it representeth. So that they must ether grant, not only the making of Images, but also the adoring, at, or before them, to be nothing contrary to this Cōmandment, or else them selues must neuer conceive the picture of Christ in their hart; or having conceived, neuer adore before, or by the helpe of such an Image. And thus much for the making and worshipping, at, or before pictures, proved from the light of nature.

12. I will yet second the same a litle further, with a short discourse which hapned betwixt my selfe, and a certaine Protestant many yeares since. This man vpon a Sondag, had come from a Sermon, where the Minister had preached vpon the second Commandment, according to the English account, and (as *Sir Humfrey* doth) bitterly inueighed against the pictures of Christ, our Lady, or any Sain'ts, as expressly contrary to that Commandment. He, in the presence of me, and sundry more of his owne Religion, highly exalted the Ministers sermon, protesting to haue bene so instructed

structed therby, and so fully edified in that point of faith, that had he any picture there, to shew his hate and spite against it, he would, if it were of wood or paper, or such matter, forthwith burne it: if of siluer, gould, or any mettall, raze, deface or disfigure it. I being there, and hearing this, presently put my hand into my pocquet, and pulling out an *Elizabeth* shilling, presented the same vnto this zealous hearer of that sermon, saying. Sir, I pray what say you to that picture; will you be as good as your word? Oh, quoth he, thats no picture of Christ, but of the *Queene*. True, quoth I, but dare you doe that to the picture of Christ, which you dare not do to the picture of a mortall creature? This struck him somewhat into a studdy: but yet to defend him selfe as far as he could, he added further. Although I will not raze or deface it, because it is the picture of the *Queene*, yet I do in no wise worship it. This, quoth I, is flatly false: for not to dare to disworship it, this alone is to worship it. Not to dare to doe any irreuerence to it, this of it selfe is to reuerence it. True, quoth he, but this is only a *Ciuilt* worship, not a *Religious*. True quoth I, but this is to change the state of the question, from the *thing* it selfe, to the *Name*: from the worship due to a picture, to the name of the worship. Againe, if *Ciuilt* worship, may be giuen to things *Ciuilt*, without the breach of Gods Commandement, why may not Religious worship be giuen to diuine things, without the breach of the same Commandement? The moderat man gaue

me thanks, and protested openly, that he would neuer beleue any Minister more in that point; & not only he, but all the company rested content. And thus many *Naturalls*, euen from naturall reason, would approue of the vse of pictures, were we but permitted to speak for our selues, as francklie and freely as Protestants are.

13. But to ratifie this a litle further by the light of *Reason*. It is a point of Protestant faith, that neuer man kept, or possibly can keepe, the ten Commandements. From this grant, I argue thus. No man euer kept, or possibly can keepe the Ten Commandements. But no man sinneth, or can possibly sinne, in not doing that which lyeth not in his power to performe, as is to make and worship the picture of Christ. Therefore no man sinneth nor can possibly sinne, ether to make or worship the picture of Christ.

14. Againe, from the same grant, I argue thus. No man eue kept, or possible can keepe the Ten Commandements: yea, he that breaketh one, is guiltie of all. Ergo all Protestants are Idolaters: and are all guiltie of Idolatrie, which aspersion yet they spitefully lay vpon vs Papists.

15. But perhaps they will say, no man euer kept, or possibly can keepe all the Ten Commandements, but yet many Christian men may keepe, yea and haue de facto kept, both that one, and many moe, continuallie. To this I answer, if that one may be alwayes kept, why not any other? If many of them may be euer kept, why not all of them,

them, or what Reason to the contrary?

16. Againe, from this grant, I argue thus. Many of the Ten Commandements, many Christian men neuer kept, nor neuer possible can keepe. Ergo many Christian men; neuer kept, nor neuer possible can keepe this Commandement, of making and worshipping the Image of Christ, and this euen by their owne confession.

17. My next Reason shall bee drawn from the facts of Protestants, and from sundry fond and fabulous Images ingented by them after many false and lying formes, in disgrace of the Pope, Religious persons, and other particulars of our profession. Which how would they euer doe, but that they know full well by the light of Reason, that Images are the bookes of ignorant people, and forcible motives to allure the harts of the simple: drawing them ether with loue and affection, or with contempt and auersion, against the thing figured to them in thole formes? Aggreable to that very saying of S. Gregorie. *Imagines & pictura sūt idioſa scriptura.* The Image and the Picture, is the ignorants scripture.

18. But to proue this from another *light*, a great deale more grateful to Protestants then that of *Nature*, or all the naturall Reasons in the world, that is to say, from the written word, the *sole Rule* of *Sir Humfreis* religion. I will proue, I say, from the written word, these seuerall things ensuing. *First*, that sundry insensible creatures haue bene vſed laudably and piously, to reduce God, his
wordes,

wordes, or workes, vnto our memorie. *Secondly*, that at, or before some of these, God hath bene called vpon and adored, which he hath either commanded, or held for seruice gratefull and agreeable to him. *Thirdly*, that this hath bene performed by the meanes of Images in particular. *Fourthly*, that such insensible creatures, haue bene accounted holy, and sundry miraculous effects haue flowed from them: which could not haue beene, if those Images, and other insensible creatures, had containd any kinde of superstition or Idolatry.

19. That some insensible creatures, haue bene piously vsed to reduce Gods wordes, or workes vnto our memorie, I proue from these ensuing places. Numb. 15. 38. *Speake to the children of Israell &c. that they make them selues fringes in the corners of their garment &c. Which when they shall see, they may remember all the Commandements of our Lord: and in them they wrote the Ten Commandements, continuing this custome to our Sauours time, as S. Mat. testifieth cap. 23. 5.*

Deut. 5. 8. the holy Scripture of such insensible creatures further saith. *Thou shalt bind them as a signe on thy hand, and they shall be, and shall moue betweene thine eyes: and thou shalt write them in the entrie, and on the dores of thy house.*

Iosue 4. 6. God willed the people of Israell to take *Twelue stones* out of the riuer of Iordan, to be a signe among you: and when your children shall aske you to morrow, saying. *What meane these stones?* you shall answer them; *The Waters of Iordan decayed before*

fore the Arke of the couenant of our Lord, When is passed ouer the same, therefore were these stones set for a monument of the children of Israel for euer.

Genel. 28. 18. Iacob arising in the morning, took the stone, which he had laid vnder his head, and erected it for a title. An act which proued so gratefull to God, that for the same he appeared to him, and approued well of the fact of this holy Patriarch. Gen. 31. 13.

1. Reg. 7. 12. The Prophet Samuel erected a stone, as far as he had driuen the Philistians, saying. Thus far hath our Lord holpen vs.

20. From these places of holy scripture, I gather these conclusions following: If the Commandements of God, were to be written in the garment of the children of Israel. If they were to be bound as a *signe* on their hand. If they were to be written on the entrie and dores of their house. If the sight of that vn sensible and outward *signe*, did serue to reduce the memorie of Gods Commandements into their mindes, why shall not a picture of Christ be made or drawen in the vestment of the Priest, or other ornaments of the Church? If they might serue for a *signe* to them, why not this for a *signe* to vs? If they might be set vp in the entrie and dores of their prophane houses, why not this without the dores, & within the dores of our sacred Churches? If the sight of them might serue to reduce the memorie of God into their mindes, why not the sight of these likewise to reduce our Sauours paines and torments

ments into ours? *Da disparitatem, & eris mihi magnus Apollo.* Giue, *Sir Humfrey*, the disparity, and I shall applaud you very highly.

21. Againē, if God willed the children of Israel to set vp ~~value~~ Stones. If they serued for a signe or monument of their deliuerie. If *Iacob* erected the stone which lay vnder his head for a Title. If God approued this fact of this holie Patriarche. If the Prophet *Samuel* erected a stone, for a signe or memorie how far God had assisted his seruants then, why may not we set vp stones now, as well as they did then? If they serued for a godly signe and Title to them, why not these for a godly signe and Title to vs? If God him selfe allowed their fact, how shall he disallow ours? If those stones serued piously for instruction, and for the preseruatiō of the memory of his mercy to them and their children, how shall not the like (yea much more liuely and mouing signes) serue for instructiue signes, to preserue the memorie of his mercie towards vs and ours? Once againē, giue the disparity and I will applaude you to the heauens? Thus much briefly (instead of much more which I could alleadge out of holy Scripture) for prooffe of the laudable vse of insensible creatures, in the seruice of almightie God.

22. I am next to proue, that at, or before sundry such insensible creatures, God hath bene called vpon and adored; which reuerentiall worship, hath bene aggreable and gratefull to him. This I proue from these ensuing places of holy Scripture.

Exode

Exod. 3. 5. God said to Moyses. Approach not hither: loose off thy shoe from thy feete, for the place wherein thou standest, is holy ground. Loehow cleare this place is, wherein a reuerentiall respect is commanded to be borne to an insensible creature, and denoide of reason, that by such an act, honor may redound to God.

2. Of Kings 6. 2. And David arose and went, and all the people that was with him of the men of Iuda, to bringe the Arke of God. vpon which was inuocated the name of the Lord of hostes, which sitteth in the Cherubins vpon it.

Psal. 98. 5. Exalt yee the Lord our God, and adore his footstoole, because it is holie. By this footstoole, sundry Doctors of the Church, vnderstand the Arke of the old Testament, which in expresse termes, David willed to be adored.

2. Paralip. 32. 12. Is not this Ezechias &c. that hath commanded Iuda and Ierusalem saying. Before an Altar you shall adore, and on it you shall burne Incense?

Ilai. 36. 7. We trust in our Lord God, is it not he, whose Excelses and Altars Ezechias hath taken away? and he said to Iuda and Ierusalem, before this Altar shal you adore.

Heb. 11. 21. By faith, Iacob dying, blessed euery one of the sonnes of Ioseph, and adored the toppe of his rodde. This last place is so plaine against Protestants, that they haue added no lesse then two wordes more then is in the Greeke, so to adulterat the text that doth condemne them.

Phillip. 2. 10. At the name of Iesue, euery knee bow,
of

of things in beauen, and things in earth, and things vnder the earth. Now, words, as Aristotle saith, are signes representatiue of the things they signifie, and are as the pictures of the eares, as the other are of the eyes: and so the very name of Iesus is worshiped, for the respect and relation it hath to him; else why make we not reuerence at the name of Iesus the sonne of Sirach, as we do at the name of Iesus Christ?

23. From these Texts, I gather these conclusions following. If God commaunded Moyses to haue a reuerentiall respect to the very ground wheron he stood, and that this honor redounded to him, why shall not the honor, done to a dead picture, redound to Christ? If the name of our Lord was inuocated vpon the Arke of wood: why may not his name be inuocated vpon a picture of wood? If that were piously adored because it was his *footstool*, why may not the Crible, the Crosse, the sepulcher be adored, because they also were his *footstools*, yea touched his very reall flesh and feete in deed, which the Arke did not? If the children of Israell adored God at, or before an Altar of Stone, why may not the children of the Church adore God, at, or before a picture of a Stone? If Iacob adored the toppe of Iosephs rodde (a true figure of the Crosse of Iesus Christ) why may not we adore the Crosse of Christ, figured to vs by that rodde? Especially sith the Apottle S. Paul saith in expresse tearmes. God forbid that I should glorie sauing in the Crosse of our Lord Iesus Christ. Gal. 6. 14.

If at the name of *Iesus* every knee be to bow, why may we not bow the knee, at, or before the name of *Iesus* in a picture? sith neither the ground, the Arke of wood, the Altar of Stone, *Iosephs* rodde, nor the name of *Iesus*, are formally honored for them selues, but for the sanctification, application, or true Relatiō they haue to him whose type they beare. And the like may be said of the Temple, the Tabernacle, the Propitiatorie, the bread of Proposition, *Moyse*s rodde, the Manna, the Tables of the Testament, and amongst Protestants, the bread and wine of their Communion which them selues receiue kneeling, and (being duly administered) were ever reuerenced by all good men, with all signes of reuerence and deuotion.

24. I am *thirdly* to proue, that this hath bene performed piously and religiously, by the meane of Images and Pictures in particular, both by their making, setting vp, and adoring, at, or before them. Where omitting that God him selfe infused the knowledge to make them into *Beseleel*, and *Oliab* (which he would neuer haue done had it bene Idolatrie;) I proue this from these ensuing places.

Exodus 25. 18. *Two Cherubins also thou shalt make of beaten gold, on both sides of the oracle &c. their faces turned vnto the propitiatorie &c. thence will I speake to thee ouer the propitiatorie, and from the midst of the two Cherubins. And vers. vlt. God wil- leth him to make all according to the patterne that was shewed him in the mount. From this place I*
gather

gather this conclusion. 1. Sith God commaunded the making of these two Images with their winges and faces: that the making of the Images of holy thinges (as Angels are) cannot be against the mind of God. 2. Sith God commanded them to be made of most pure *beaten gold*, that he had no base, but a very high esteeme of holy Images. 3. Sith he promised to speake to *Moyse* from the *midst of them* (which may seeme to imply some danger) yet may he safely be adored at, before, or in that picture from which he speaketh. 4. Sith God him selfe gaue this patterne in the Mountaine, the making such holy pictures came, not from a bad inuention, nor cannot haue an euill ground in the practise or execution.

3. Reg. 6. 23. 29. 32. *And he (Salomon) made in them Cherubes, and palme trees, and diuers pictures, as it were standing out of the wall.* The like we read in sundry other places as, 2. Paralip. 3. 7. & 4. 3. 14. & 5. 7. & 9. 18. Hence I gather these conclusions. 1. That the making of all carued or grauen Images, were not vnlawfull, but that some might be laudable made for the honor of God. 2. That such raised, or standing pictures, were placed in the sanctuarie it selfe, the most honorable place of all the Temple; With what conscience then can these men crie out, that it is Idolatry in vs, to place the picture of Christ in our Churches? 3. Whatsoever was placed there and applyed to a pious vse, had doubtlesse some Relative honor done vnto it, for, and to whole honor and seruice, it was

was there placed and applied. Nay, neuer was there any thing placed by Gods appointment or his Prophets, in his Temple, to which some honor was not due,

1. Of Kings 6. 2. &c. The Philistians said, *What shall we doe with the Arke of our Lord? Tell vs how we may send it back into his place.* To whom the Priests answered. *Send it not away emptie, but that which you owe, rendre vnto it for sinne. &c. You shall make the similitudes of your Emroides, and the similitudes of the Mife that haue destroyed the land: and you shall giue glorie to the God of Israell.* From this place I gather these conclusions following. 1. That the Philistians being stricken with *Emroides*, and hauing their land destroyed with *Mife*, to appease God, they made the similitudes of them both, and put them at the side of the Arke into a Casket. 2. That in doing this, they did an act of honor, and rendred vnto it that which they owed for sinne. 3. That in so doing, they gaue glory to the God of Israel. 4. Hence it followeth, that the remembrance of holy things (yea euen of Gods punishments, when they are sent to vs for our amēdment) may be made, may be placed in a holy place, and oblations may be made vnto them, and glory giuen to God by such an act.

Numb 21. 8. *And Moyses prayed for the people, and our Lord spake to him: Make a brasen Serpent, and set it for a signe, he that being stricken, looketh on it, shall liue.* Moyses therfore made a brasen Serpent, and set it for a signe: Whom when they that were, stricken,

Ll

looked

looked on, they were healed. From this place I gather these conclusions following. 1. That God forbidding the Images of Idols, made by men for an euill purpose, yet commaunded *Moyſes* (a deadlie enimie of Idolatrie) to make this Image for a good purpose. 2. He commanded the setting it vp for a ſigne, of the mercie he intended to ſhew to his afflicted people. 3. He promiſed health and life to thoſe who came before it, and looked on it: which effects truly followed accordingly. 4. Chriſt (*Iohn 3.*) expoundeth the ſetting vp of this braſen Serpent, of him ſelfe to be crucified. 5. *Auſten lib. 3. de Trinit. cap. 10.* with many other Doctours, affirme that the people of the Iewes, performed this with a certaine inclination of the bodie; and nothing improbable, receiuing thence ſo great a benefit. 6. If this honor were done to, at, or before the braſen Serpent, a figure of Chriſt, why may not the like be done to Images, the figures of Chriſt? If this honor were giuen to that Tree, the figure of the Croſſe, why not to the Croſſe of Chriſt, the truth of that figure?

25. I am laſtly to proue, that ſuch inſenſible creatures, haue bene alwayes accounted holy: and that ſundry miraculous effects (thorough the power of God) haue flowed from them, for example; God could haue healed the blinde in the goſpell without the helpe of clay or ſpittle, yet would he vſe the one and the other, in reſtoring the blinde mans ſight. God could haue healed the woman of the bloody flux, without the touch of the hem-

me of his garment, yet would he serue him selfe of that insensible creature for to cure her. God could haue cured many sick immediatly, without the secondary meanes of *S. Peters* shadow (*Acts. 5.*) But his shadow, was but a certaine Image of him selfe: therefore *Saint Peters* Image wrought a miracle. God could haue cured all those that were itunge with serpents, without the helpe of the brasen Serpent, yet such miraculous effects flowed from that holy picture. All which considered, with what face can Protestants deny, the laudable and pious vse of insensible creatures, and particularly of holy pictures, to reduce the wordes or maruelous workes of God vnto our memorie? Or with what forehead can they so often alleadge that old spur-gald obiection, *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen Images?* But to come to an end of this Paragraph, you goe forward and say.

Sir Humfrey pag. 211.

Tertullian puts the question, and returnes an excellent answer, which may serue for him and vs. Some man will object; *Why did Moyses make the Image of the brasen Serpent in the Wilderneße?* Well and good; one and the same God bath by his generall law forbidden an Image to be made, and also by his extraordinary and speciall commandment, an Image of a Serpent to bee made; If thou bee obedient to the same God, thou hast his law, make thou no Image; But if thou haue a regard to the Image of the Serpent, make

*not any Image against the law, vntlesse God command
thes, as he did Moyses.*

A N S W E R.

This place of *Tertullian*, may be answered sundry wayes. 1. He saying. *Make thou no Image*; may be vnderstood thus, to expresse the diuine Essence: to adore with the honor of *Latria*, only due to God him selfe, to worship the same instead of the true God: herein wee agree with *Tertullian*, 2. He saying, *Make not any Image against the law*, suppoeth that Image of the braten Serpent, not to be made against the law: suppoeth also, that some Images (as thole of Christ) may bee made, by the speciall law of his Church, without the breach of his generall law, else euen that of the Serpent, had bene against the same law: and herein hee agrees with vs. 3. The same *Tertullian*, whom you cite in his 2. booke against *Marcion*, saith thus. If it were lawfull for the Iewes to make the braten Serpent for the signification of Christ, how much more is it lawfull to make the Image of Christ. Teste *Nicolburne* cap. 32. pag. 167. de Imag. 4. For not making them without Commandment: what say you to the fact of *Salomon* 3. Reg. 6. 32. setting vp of Cherubins in the temple, without any expresse Commandment for his doings? Why may not we in imitation of him, set vp in our Churches the picture of Christ, without any expresse Commandment for it, especially *S. Paul* saying, that what was written, was for our Example

Example and instruction? Meane while, whilst I leaue you to tuggle with *Tertullian*, I recōmand vnto you these few Nutts to crack, together with the former which I haue giuen you.

1. I say then *first*, that these words of the Commandment (*Thou shalt not make to thee a graven thing*) wherabout all our contention is, God him selfe in the very same Chapter verse 23. to shew what he intended principallie to prohibit therby, explaneth in most cleare words his owne meaning, saying. *You shall not make Gods of siluer, nor Gods of gould shall you make to you.* Which alone proueth all the Protestants cauillation, to bee meere calumnies: for who euer heard, that wee making Images of gold or siluer, ment to make them Gods?

2. I say *secondly*, that an Idol, being properly that which is nothing, (as *S. Paul* testifiyeth) or that which represents the thinge that is not, Protestants cannot call the Image of Christ, an Idol, vnlesse they belecue there was neuer such a man as Christ in the world. For it followes necessarilie. The Image of Christ crucified, is an Idoll: therfore Christ was neuer crucified. Yea, the very Etymologie of the word *Simulachrum*, according to ould *Lactantius*, denotes this: which is as much as a counterfet, false, or dissembled Image. lib. 2. cap. 19. which who will censure of the Image of Christ?

3. I say *thirdly*, with the *Rhemists*, that to paint any of the three Persons, as they appeared visi-

blie and corporally, is no more inconuenient nor vnlawfull, then it was vndecent or vnlawfull for them to appeare vnto vs in such formes. And sith God often spoke when as no forme at all appeared, and might haue so spoken still, he him selfe appearing in such corporall formes, ether must needes be said to haue administred the occasion of such Idolatrie, or wee no Idolaters for for painting that forme, wherein him selfe spake & appeared vnto vs.

4. I say *fourthly*, if God had vtterly forbidden Images, he had commanded *Moyse* to breake his owne Commandement, when he willed him to make the Images of Angels, and of the brazen Serpent, and so should haue bene contrary to him selfe: But this were both absurd, and blasphemie to imagine. Ergo he forbid not the making of all Images absolutely, but only such as should represent God in any figure, such as we perceiue by sense in heauen or earth, and such as should be worshipped as God him selfe. Wherof the reason might be, because indeed there could be no Image made like vnto God: but since the second person of the Trinitie tooke humane flesh, and God became man, we haue as it were a sensible God, of whom we may make a true Image: and thus this Commandment hath no place at all against vs.

5. I say *fifthly*, ether it is against the law of Nature to make Images, or it is not. If it bee against the law of nature, then you condemne your selues in making the picture of the Kinge, of the Pope, of
your

your wiues children and other frendes, of *Martin Luther* and the like. If it bee not euill of it selfe, but only so far as it is referd to some euill end, then the Catholiques making all their Images for some good or godly end, (as 1. for the benefit of those that cannot reade at all. 2. the more to stir vp the mindes of those that can, by making a more liuely impression of the death and paines which our Sauour endured for vs) their making of them is not vnlawfull.

6. I say *sixtly*, admitting it had bene forbidden the people of the Iewes to make any maner of Images at all, yet it followes not that it is forbidden vnto vs: because as concerning the Commandements of the old law, we are only bound to that which belongeth to the law of nature or morall law, as I haue proued a litle before pag. 501. But God him selfe who neuer altered the law of nature, commanded the making of good Images, euen then when hee forbid the making of bad; ergo it was a positive law, and bindes not vs, although I should grant it bound them. Againe *Exod 32.* the people worshipping a Calfe for God, *Leuiticus 9. 2.* God commanded them, to *take of the beard, a Calfe for sinne*, and to offer it before our Lord, so to keepe them from Idolatrie. Euen so Images, which though by them might be abused, yet by vs may be vsed to Gods honor: because nether euery Idol, is an Image, nor *e contra*, euery Image an Idol.

7. I say *sauenthly*, if Images be considered in

Ll 4

them

them selues, the exemplar excluded, they are not capable of adoration, or of any outward signe of submissiō, for they are things inanimate, no wayes capable of honor or contumelie, wherof only naturall reason is capable : but if wee consider the Exemplar in them, which is the next formall tearme of internall adoration, then the case is quite altered. For nether do we acknowledg Images of them selues, to bee our Superiors, nor to do wee with any inward affection subiect our selues vnto them as their seruants or inferiors, and therefore are no way to be worshipped for them selues, to wit, as disioyned or secluded from the exemplar. Whence plainly appeareth, the reason of the Picture to bee placed, not in the matter, but in the Relation or Representation : nor yet the wood and stone to bee worshipped, but all the honor which is exhibited to the Image, to redound to the Prototypon, sith the Image and the Prototypon, are not considered as two things, but as one. This is cleare in that of Gen- 37. 33. When *Iacob* kissed his sonne *Iosephs* coate, embrued with the blood of the kid, embracing it, and making heauie moane ouer it, his affection rested not in the coate it selfe, but was directed to *Ioseph*, whose vnfortunate death that bloody coate represented to him : euen such esteeme, and no other haue wee of the Images of Christ and his Saintes, which wee account as the bloody garment of our beloved *Ioseph*.

8. I lay rightly, with that learned author of the
Reioynder

Reioynder to Doctor Whises Reply pag. 154. This Commandement, *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe a grauen Image &c.* ether makes against them selues, or nothing at all against vs: which thus hee proueth. The Images wee are forbidden to worship, we are forbidden to make. And contrarywise, the Images we may lawfully make, we may lawfully worship. (if they bee Images of adorable persons.) But the Images of Christ which wee worship, Protestants make, yea some (to wit Lutherás) set them vp in their Churches. Ergo they cannot condemne our adoration of them, vnles they likewise condemne their owne making of them, as against Gods law. If they answer, we are not forbidden to make them, but only not to make them, with intention to adore them: If they, to excuse their custome of making of them, may adde to Gods expresse word (*Thou shalt not make*) by way of explication (*with purpose and intension to adore them:*) why may not Catholiques, to excuse their custome of adoring them, adde to Gods word, by way of explication, with intention to adore them as God, or with that diuine worship which is only due to God him selfe? Hence it is cleare, that if they admit one, they must needs admit the other. If they condemne one, they must needs condemne both, Gods word being as expresse against *Image making*, as against *Image-adoring*: or if the place be hard to vnderstand, why build they their faith thereon against vs?

9. I say *ninthly*, out of the same Author pag. 136. All kinde of honor and worship is due to the man Christ IESVS, which can bee due vnto any other man, whom we are bound to respect. But vnto other persons whom wee are bound to respect, we owe reuerence to their Image, more or lesse according to their dignitie: and this dutie is double, the one *Negative*, neuer to disgrace their Images; the other *Affirmative*, which is actually to exhibit honor to their Images, when otherwise the denyall therof will be taken as an irreuerence and contempt towards them. Therefore to the Images of Christ, we owe this double dutie of honor; *Negative*, neuer to disgrace it. *Positive*, to reuerence the same outwardly, when otherwise the neglect of reuerence to his Image, is and ought to bee taken, as want of due reuerence to his person, These two reasons *Sir Humfrey*, it is cleare that you had seene, by that which you alleadge out of the same Author pag. 202. but being too heauie, or too hot for your fingers, you thought it wisdome to let them alone.

10. I say *tenthly*, that Apocalips 13. 14. the scripture foresheweth & assureth, that *Antechrist* (who in euery thing wil seeke by emulation to haue that honor given him which is due to Christ) shall haue his Image worshiped of his seruants, yea, and that it shall do strange miracles in apparance. But this Image shall not be against the honor of Antechrist, but expressely for it. Therefore the Image of Christ, though worshipped, is not against the
the

the honor of Christ, but greatly for it, which by opposition, Antechrist will seeke to robbe his Image of, as his forerunners do at this day. Nor is it likely that the Diuell by wicked emulation and opposition, would euer cause that feigned miracles should be wrought by the Image of Antechrist, but that he saw that many true miracles had beene wrought by the Images of Iesus Christ and of his seruants, in the Catholique Church.

11. Thus hauing stragled with you *Sir Humfrey* from the state of our question, only to disabule those who are abused by your booke, I come at last to call vpon you, according to my wonted custome, for the satisfaction of your promise, for your answer to the Iesuits Challenge, *Where Was your Church before Luther?* Especially sith your selfe confesse. It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages. Especially sith holy Scripture assureth vs. And hee gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the Ministrie, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill wee meete all into the vnitie of faith, and knowledge of the Sonne of God into a perfect man. *Ephes. 4. 11.*

12. The noble *Iudith*, as you know, cut off the head of *Holifernes* with his owne sword. Will you see the same, *Sir Humfrey*, done to your selfe, which

which was done to *Holofernes*? Marke the stroke then of your own sword, and tell me where your head lyes. That Church which had visible professors in Christ and his Apostles time, had visible professors in all Ages. But from Christ and his Apostles times, no Christian Church had visible professors in all Ages, saue only the Church of Rome, (in whose only bosome from that time to this, Protestants euer lay inbreasted.) Therefore the Church of Rome only, is the true Christian Church, which had visible professors in all Ages.

13. You, for your part, right like to the Milhorse, haue gone a great iorney, you haue drawe after you a great waight, you haue laboured much, and yet are still in the same place you were, when first you set forth into your *Safe Way*. You haue named vnto vs, I know not how many of the visible professors of our Church, Popes, Cardinalls, Patriarkes, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Monkes, Friars, Iesuits, Doctors, and Pastors of our profession, but where are all this while the visible professors of your owne? *Their Persons*, I say, not the Persons of *Ours*? *Her Professors*, not ether her, or our Profession? The particular *Parties*? *Their Particular Names*, not the particular Points, which ether you at this presēt, or we, or any other maintayned in times past? As for those which you haue hicherto named, they were for the most part, not any better Protestants then the Pope of Rome, and you had as litle reason to alleadge them for yours, as if we should alleadge *John Fox*, *John*

Le Well

Jewel, and *Sir Humfrey Lynde*, to be all men of our Religion, and our faith to bee inuolued and in-breasted in the bosome of your English Church, because (forsooth) wee finde here and there scatteringly, somewhat in your, or their writings, which in outward shew, or with a litle addition or deprauation, makes for prooffe of our Papist profession. This, *Sir Humfrey*, is all the shift you haue to saue your honestie, when you are asked by vs. *Where Was your Church before Luther?* Which how fillie it is, I leaue to euery childe to iudge. And therefore call vpon you as before, that you shew vs, that you produce vnto vs, that *Catalogue* of your visible Protestant Professors before *Luther*, which we haue so much longed for. Those visible Protestant Professors, as he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophetes, that are from the beginning. *Luc. 1. 70.* Those visible Protestant professors, as hee spake by the mouth of *S. Paul*, that are to continue to the ending. *Ephes. 4. 11.* Those visible Protestant professors, which according to the Royall psalmist, did *Dominate in medio inimicorum*, rule in the very midst of her enemies, *psal. 109.* lastly, a *Catalogue* of such visible Protestant professors, succeeding one another in all Ages, as I by Gods assistance, will shew you before wee part, of visible Papist professors in all Ages, which till you performe, nether wil Protestants cōciences be thoroughly satisfied, nor Papists mouthes be fully stopped, to call vpon you, *Where Was your Church before Luther?*

Parag. I X.

Indulgences.

IT is the tenth Article of the Roman Creed : I do hold, that the power of Indulgences, was left by Christ to the Church, and I affirme the vse thereof to be most wholsome for Christs people.

This Doctrine was proclaimed by the Councell of Trent, where it was likewise declared, that whereas Christ did leave Indulgences to the Church, and the Church did vse that diuine power so granted in ancient times, therefore the sacred Councell doth teach and command them to be retayned in the Church, and condemne all them with a curse, which either tearme them vnprofitable, or deny the Churches authority to graunt them. A reason no dout sufficient for the Church of Rome to grant them, and to lay *Anathema* vpon all such as shall deny them, since Christ (as they say) did first ordaine them, and the ancient Fathers did exercise the power committed to them by Christ. But when we come to examination of witnesses (notwithstanding the Popes Creed, and the Councells decree) it will be found, that neither Christ nor the primitive Fathers, euer knew, much lesse exercised such pardons and Indulgences, as are now daylie practised in the Church of Rome.

A N S W E R.

2. We are now, *Sir Humfrey*, come to the last of these *Nine long Paragraphes*, and *Tenth Article of the Roman Creed*, to wit, *Indulgences*: wherof we see what the Pope & Councell saith against your Doctrine. We likewise see what you say, against the Popes Creed, and the Councells Decree, both in this, and all the other precedent Paragraphes. You pretend to *examine Witnesses* about this point. But what *Witnesses*, will you, or can you *examine* against a Councell? Who shall examine those your witnesses? Who shall iudge of their Evidences? What voice more convincing, what verdict more powerful, then the voice and verdict of the whole Church? If according to *S. Pauls doctrine* (1. Tim. 5. 19.) no accusation may be admitted against a Priest, but vnder two or three witnesses, you bringing so few witnesses against the Senat of the whole world, against the Parliament, & Supream Seate of the vniuersall Church, against so many hundreds of venerable, famous, and learned Bishops, in what steed will these few *Witnesses* stand you? Or who, but one very *Witlesse*, will euer hearken to such *Witnesses*? We haue laid somewhat heretofore, pag. 405. concerning *Councells*, and about the force of their Definitions and Conclusions. I here craue leave of you, to adde a litle more to the former, so to set our harts at rest about this matter, if it may be. Be attentiuie then I pray you this once, to a poore mans tale, whilst I lay before you

you these ensuing considerations. 1. That there is a certaine *Scandalous Euill* in this life (called *heresie*) wherto the Church of God, and Sheepfould of *Iesus Christ*, is subiect. 2. That there are certaine peculiar and select *Persons*, and those designed by God him selfe, to whom the Cure of this so great an *Euill*, and the sauegard of the Sheepfould, is committed: with the Extent of their Charge and Office. 3. On the part of the *Sheepe*, the strict *Bond* and *Dutie*, they haue punctually to heare & obey the voice of their Pastors, and simply without controlement, to admit their cure. 4. The Cariage & Proceeding of the Pastors of the Church, in labouring to cure and take away the scandalous *Euill* of this age, which did perturb the Churches peace. 5. The Cariage and Comportment of Catholiques and Protestants, in this present occasion: and whether of them haue shewed themselves the more humble, dutifull, and obedient sheepe to their Pastors voices.

2. Touching the first, to wit the *scandalous Euill* wherto the Church & Sheepfould of Christ is subiect in this present life, the verdict of the great Sheaphheard himselfe doth assure vs, that it shall be subiect to most great *Euils*, such as shall disturbe its peace, offend the consciences of the weake, scatter the flock, yea, lead the Elect them selues into error, if it were possible. *It is necessarie*, saith he, *that scandals doe come*, but neuertheles, *Woe so that man by whom the scandall cometh*. Math. 18. 7. And *S. Paul*, that great Secretarie of our great Sheaphheard,

pheard, doth depaint vnto vs in particular, that great Euill of all Euills, the Euill of Heresie, which he prophetically foretels shall trauell the Church, saying. *There must be heresies also, that they also which are approued, may be made manifest among you* (1. Cor. 11. 19.) And yet further. *I know that after my departure, there will rauening Woules enter in among you, not sparing the flock: and out of your owne selues shall arise men speaking peruerse things &c. For the which cause be vigilant.* Acts 20. 29. Here Christ him selfe telleth vs, that scandalls are necessarie. Yea, S. Paul seemes to suppose that great Euill of Heresie to be of necessitie, saying. *Oportet. It behoueth; it must be;* a saying, almost incredible, but to a Christian: whose doubt notwithstanding he forthwith cleareth, saying. *That they which are approued, may be made manifest; Approued, that is, tempted and persecuted by Heretikes, yet did not turne. Approued, that is, by the voice of their Pastors, that for the defence of their faith, they had fought a good fight, had kept the faith, and therefore had deserued a Crowne: yea, to be manifested before God, before men, and before his Angells. Lo the end why God permitteth so great a Scandall and so great an Euill as heresie is in the Church, to wit, to approue, & to make the glorie of the faithfull the more manifest.*

3. Touching the second, to wit, the Persons of those to whom the Sheepfold of Christ is committed & designed by God to redresse these Euils, to take away these scandalls, and to keepe

the Sheepe of Christ from the rauening Wolues, together with the Extent of their Charge & Office, hearken to whom the holy Ghost speaketh when he saith thus. *Take heed to your selues and the whole flock, wherein the holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops to rule the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his owne blood. Acts 20. 28.* Hearken further to whom the selfe same Spirit speaketh, when he saith thus. *Feed the flock of God which is among you &c. and when the Prince of Pastors shall appere, you shall receiue the incorruptible crowne of glorie. 1. Pet 5. 2.* Wherto I may aptly adde that which is the burden of ourould song *And he gaue some Ap. stles, & some Prophets, and other some Euangeliſts, and other some Pastors and Doctors, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the worke of the Ministrie, for the edifying of the body of Christ &c. vnto a perfect man &c in all things &c.* From these sacred Texts, I gather these inetiagable truths. As much as Christ purchased with his owne blood, so much Bishops and Pastors are to Rule. But Christ (according to S. Paul) purchased the whole Church with his blood. Therefore they are to rule the whole Church. S. Peter willeth them to feede the flock which is among them. But the whole flock is among them. Therefore they are to feede the whole flock. The same S. Paul further saith, *that he gaue some Pastors, and other some Doctors for the worke of the Ministrie, for the building vp the body of Christ vnto a perfect man, and hat in all things.* Therefore, as long as the worke of the Ministry lasteth, as long

as the body of Christ is a building, so long their Charge and Office lasteth, to take away scandals, to roote out heresies, to keepe the flock from the rauening wolues, and to perfect this mysticall body, euen in all things.

4. Touching the Third, as the holy Scripture declareth the Charge and Office of the Pastors, so doth it likewise the *Bond* and *Dutie* of the *Sheepe*, which euen the head Shepheard himself doth thus lay downe. If thy brother offend thee, rebuke him betwixt thee and him; And if he will not heare thee, ioyne with thee one or two besides thy selfe; And if he will not heare them, tell the Church. And if he will not heare the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the Publican. Mar. 18. 17. Heare againe the same great Shepheard of our soules saying thus. He that beareth you, beareth me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me. Luc. 10. 16. But wonderfull it is to heare what the same great Pastor saith to his people in theould law. If thou perceiue that the iudgment with thee be hard and dourfull betweene blood and blood, cause and cause, leprosie and not leprosie, and thou see that the Word of the Iudge within thy gates do varie, arise and goe vp to the place which our Lord thy God shall choose: and thou shalt come to the Priest of the Leuiticall stock & to the Iudge that shall be in that time, and thou shalt aske of them, Who shall shew thee the truth of the Iudgment. And thou shalt doe whatsoever they that are Presidents of the place which our Lord shall choose, shall say and

teach thee according to his law. And thou shalt follow
their sentence: neither shalt thou decline to the right-
hand, neither to the left; but be that shall be proud, refus-
ing to obey the commandement of the Priest which at
that time ministrerh to our Lord thy God, and the de-
cree of the Iudge, that man shall die, and thou shalt
take away the rull out of Israell, and the whole peo-
ple hearing shall feare, that none after ward swell in
pride. Deut. 17 8.

5. Great truly, and manifold are the docu-
ments, which may be gathered from this sacred
Doctrine. For we perceiue that the Iudgement be-
twixt vs and Protestants, and betwixt their cause
and ours, is hard and doubtfull. We see that the
words of infer or Iudges within their, in our gates,
doe greatly varie. We haue arriuen therefore, and
gone vp to the place which our Lord our God hath
chofen. We haue gone to the Soueraigne Priest of
the Leuiticall stock: to the Iudge of that time. We
haue asked of him the truth of the Iudgmēt. God him-
selfe doth assure vs, hat hee, together with those
that do assist him, shall shew vs the truth of the Iudge-
ment. God commañdeth vs to doe, whatsoeuer he and
they, shall say and teach, without declining, e ther
to the right hand, or the left. We, fearing to bee
proud (as all Heretiques are.) We fearing to refuse
to obey the decree and commandement of the Priest
appointed by God. We fearing to dye, and to be
taken out of Israell, haue, like obedient Sheepe,
obeyed the voice of our Pastor, and haue assen-
ted to his Centure, in those Twelue Articles, as
you

you please to call them, of the new Roman Creed. Now what say you to this, will you, or can you blame vs, for obeying the voice of God, thus straitly threatening and commanding?

6. Touching the fourth, to wit, the Cariage of the Pastors in applying the Cure to that present heresie that did disturbe the Sheep committed to them, thoe of your Religion pretended abuses & pernicious errors to be admitted by the Church and all her Pastors. You accuse her, and call her in question about Twelve new Articles, that nether Christ, nor the Primitive Fathers euer knew. What would you haue the Pastors now to doe in this case, more then they haue done for the peace and sauegard of the Sheepe? What the Sheepe, more then they haue done to comply with their Pastors? The head and chiefe Pastor of them all, he who sits in his seate, to whom our Saviour said, *Peeter louest thou me more then these &c? Feede my Lambes, feede my Sheepe* (Iohn 21.) encharging him with the care of the whole Church, and cōfirmatiō of his bretherē, sends abroad his letters, missiue into the whole world. He summons his bretheren and fellow Bishops to appeare. He assigns them a particular place. They obey, and many hundreds of them out of sundry tongues and Nations, meete and assemble them selues together vpon this commandment. They heare, examine, and after the example of the Primitive Church, define laying.

7. The Apostles and Ancients, the bretheren, to the

bretheren of the Gentills that are at Antioch, and in Syria, and Cylicia, (Germanie, England, France, Ireland &c.) greeting. Because we haue heard, that certaine going forth from vs (Luther, Caluin, and their like) haue troubled you with words, subuerting your soules, to whom we gaue no commandement, it hath pleased vs, being gathered in one, and it hath seemed good to the holy Ghost and vs, that you receiue, hould, and vnanimously embrace these points of faith and doctrine following; viz. Iustification by Works, not by faith only. The Supper of our Lord, not to be an emptie figure and signe only, but to contayne his very body. The bread, not to remayne, but to be really Transubstantiated after the words of Consecration. Seauen Sacraments, not two only, to be firmly beleueed of the faithfull. Communion in one kinde only, to suffice the Laitie. Images of Christ to be worshiped. Indulgences to be wholsomly granted, and the like: the which thinges keeping according to the precept of vs your Pastors, you shall do well: far yee well. Acts 15. 24. Thus the head and Pastors of the Church, to the vniuersall flock of Christ, designed by God him selfe to him to keepe: according to that of Christ our Lord Iohn 10. 16. And there shall be made one fould, and one Pastor.

8. Touching the fift, to wit, the Cariage of vs and Protestants in this occasion, it hath bene shewed what the Pastors haue done, it hath bene likewise shewed what we their Sheep haue done, to obuiat and oppose this Euill, this Scandall, this Heresie, which hath disturbed the peace of the whole

whole Church, and endangered the flock of *ie us* Christ. There needes no more now (in my iudgment) but only to enquire what you and yours haue done, o auoide the danger of so great a disaster, by only comparing together our two comportments. You then perceiuing the Iudgment or Controuerisie betwixt you and vs, to be *hard and doubtfull*; You seeing that the words of your Iudges and ours, did greatly *varie*. 1. You haue not according to Gods appointment, arisen, and gone vp to that *Place*, where the Pastors of the Church assembled them selues together to consult of this case, and to redresse so great an *Euill*, so great a *Scandall*: and so haue shewed your selues carelesse of the flock of Christ, *which he hath purchased with his owne blood*; carelesse in this rage or heresie, to keepe them from the rauening Wolves. 2. You haue not repaired to one Supream Iudge for the time, to determine the doubts then arisen: for neither did, nor doe, externe Churches acknowledge your Princes, nor Pastors, their Supream Iudges, nor yet you, theirs, nor them for yours. 3. Your Supream Iudge was not a Priest of the *Leuiticall* (that is to say Apostolicall) *stock* (as our Iudge *Leo the Tenth* was;) for neither was King *Harrie* a layman, nor *K. Edward* a childe, nor *Q. Elizabeth* a woman, Priests of the Apostolicall stock: no one Bishop alone within the same kingdome doe, or did your selues admit for this Supream Iudge: nor had you one such Iudge of the Apostolicall Stock: therefore you had no lawfull Iudge at all.

4. You haue not asked of this one Supream Iudge, *the truth of the Iudgment*: nor had he tould you, will you stand to the Iudgment of any such Iudge, nor any such Court in the whole world; beleeuing that it is possible for both him, & them to erre, euen in *things appertaining vnto God*: because as you say, *all men are lyars*; and so hauing no one Iudge, no one assured *truth of Iudgment*, all men being lyars, you must needs beleeu nothing but lyes, or else beleeu nothing at all. 5. This one determinat Place; this one determinat Iudge; this Iudge of the *Leuiticall Stock*, this *truth of Iudgment*, not being found with you, it must follow that they were all to be found somewhere else, otherwise the word of God must needes be false: but in that we repaired to *Trent*, as to one determinat Place: to Pope Leo the Tenth, as to one determinat Iudge. He being truly descended of the *Apostolicall Stock*: it followeth necessarily, that his sentence is that *truth of Iudgment*, which was to determine all the doubt. Which, because we like obedient sheepe haue obeyed, we cannot be accounted heathens and Publicans. Which because you haue proudly despised, therefore you haue despised Christ. One Iudge, one sentence and Iudgment, was to appease that vnhappy storme, thorough the whole world: ether this therefore was that *one Iudge* & that *one Iudgmēt*, or there was none in the whole world. Yours, was for England only: your sēce bound no Church in the whole world besides your owne: no Church in the whole world will be

be bound by yours: all Catholique Churches in the world (in matters of faith) haue bound themselves, and haue assented to this soueraigne sentence of this soueraigne Iudge; therefore that voice, was the true voice of Christ, he the true Shepheard wherto the whole flock and fould of Christ was bound to obey, and we the humble and obedient Sheep, which haue obeyed the voice of our Iudge & soueraigne Pastor, according to the strict Commandement of God him selfe. What can you say now against so cleare and euident scripture, and against so cleare & euident reasons deduced from thence?

9. But perhaps you will say here, that this Councell, was not a true and lawfull Councell. That these Pastors, were not true and lawfull Pastors, nor their voices those which Christ commanded to be heard. To make all things safe and sure, we will next proceed to examine this point, which the better to performe, I would pray my Reader to obserue these reasons ensuing. 1. That the great *Necessitie* and Distraction of the Church considered, it was right needfull for conseruation of the faithfull in the vnity of faith, that a *Generall Councell* should be called. No Church hath done this, for these hundred yeares last past, since the arising of *Luthers* heresie, saue only ours: no Church, no Communitie of Christians (though attempting) haue, or could doe this, saue only ours. Therefore ours is She, who had the sole care in this Distraction: ours is She, who only hath, and can call a
Gene-

Generall Councell: consequentlie, ours is She, who consisted of those lawfull Pastors and voices, which Christ commanded to be heard vnder paine of being accounted a heathen.

10. The 2. point which I would haue my Reader to obserue, is, that since the times of our Saviour and his Apostles, sundry *Generall Councils* for the like Causes and Necessities, haue bene kept; as namely those four first which *S. Gregorie the Great*, and all good Christians, hold to bee of equall authoritie with the four Gospels, and were worthely allowed by Act of Parliament in the first yeare of *Queene Elizabeth*: Now to cleare this point concerning the lawfullnes of this one Council, we will compare it with sundry others, so to see wherein wee can discouer any disparitie.

1. They were called by their Head, the Bishop of Rome; with whom, as *Socrates* and *Sozomon* affirme, no General Councell can bee lawfully called: or at least hee consenting: as is learnedly vrged by Doctor *Harding* against *M. Iewel*, Confut. Apol. pag. 248. So was this.

2. The *Summons* of those, were *Vniuersall*. to wit, of all Bishops thorough out the world, they being principally those as hath bene proued who the holy Ghost hath placed to Rule the Church. So was it in this.

3. In them the Head him selfe was in person present, or at least by his *legats* deputed by him, if for any iust cause, as sicknesse or imprisonment,
him

him selfe could not come in person. So was it in this.

4. In them, touching their *Election* and Choice, was supposed to be gathered together, the *Gratuitie*, the *Sanctitie*, the *Authoritie*, the *Wisdome* and *Learning* of the whole Church. So was it in this.

5. They so assembled fasted, prayed, consulted the *Scriptures*, and the generall practise and Tradition of all Christian Churches then extant, and the *Fathers* and other *Councils* doctrine before them. So did this.

6. They represented the whole Church, their voice was reputed by all good Christians, for the true voice of the Spouse of Christ, for the true voice of the whole body, for the Parliament of the whole world, for the Organ of the Holie Ghost, according to that of holie Scripture, saying. *It seemed good to the Holie Ghost and vs.* So was it, and ought to be in this.

7. In them free accesse was given to the hereticks of that age, to appeare and exhibit their reasons, by a safe conduct to all nations for the securitie of their persons. So was it in this.

8. The *Decrees* of other Councils, were confirmed by the Pope, without whose authoritie, as no Generall Council can bee lawfully called, so no *Decrees* lawfully confirmed. So was it in this.

9. In them the *Originalls* of the Copies and *Decrees* of the Council, subscribed with the handes of the *Fathers* present, haue alwayes remained

mayned in the handes and custodie of the Church of Rome. So do they of this.

10. The *End* of thole (and their *Meanes* answerable to their *End*) was to cause by such a General Councell, a generall Conformitie of faith, thorough out all Christendome. So was it in this.

11. In them, *sundry Nations* of the Christian world were assembled. So was there in this, in which there were gatherd, *more severall Nations*, then there are *Shires* in England; *More yeares* were bestowed in Consultation, then *Weekes* in your full Parliament. *More Bishops* deined and subscribed, then were *Ministers* of all sorts in your notable Synode; as. D. Harding most learnedly hath noted. in his Confut of M. Jewels Apologie pag. 277.

12. In them it was necessarie that there should bee some *Supream* Iudgment (according to Gods owne ordonance Deuter. 17. 8.) wherunto the whole Church should submit it selfe. So is it in this.

13. In them all their Canonickall Decrees and solutions, concerning faith, without further examen, were forthwith obeyed of all good Christians, for feare of that severe sentence, given by God him selfe against the proud, the obitinat and rebellious. So is it in this.

14. In them, the holy Ghost promised to bee present: to assist them in that distresse: and to leade them into all truth. Who therefore can doubt but that he doth the like in this?

15. Should

15. Should those of that time, have taken away that soveraigne Iudgmēt then, there would have bene no Iudgment at all left in the vniuersall Church, to suppress hereſie at its arising. Euen so would it be, should we take away this.

16. If those Generall Councells could not erre, so nor this: vnlesse wee will say the holy Ghost is changed. If they could, all the condemnations of old heretickes, made by Generall Councells in former times, may againe bee called in question: for weaken one, we weaken all.

17. If the Bishops and Prelats of the vniuersall Church, can them selues erre in a Generall Councell, how hath Christ committed the keeping therof to their charge? How can they (as they are wild. Ephes. 4. 11.) keepe the same from *Wauering*? If that of all Nations may erre, what assurance of that of one Nation in particular?

18. Contrary to all that hath bene hitherto said, Protestants haue no one *head Bishop*, to call together all their Bishops.

19. Their Sumons are neuer vniuersall, and so cannot possibly procure the Commō and vniuersall good.

20. In their Reformed Assemblies, nether is the supream head of any other externe Church personally present, nor yet in those of the Reformed French, Scotch & other Churches, wil they admit the presence and iudgment of their owne Kings.

21. Theirs consists of meere secular and lay persons,

persons, neuer to be paragonized with Priests, for Sanctitie, Authoritie, and sacred learning.

22. No reformed English, French, Scotch or Dutch assembly, euer represented the whole Church: nor were their voices reputed for the voice of the Spouse of Christ, of the body of Christ, nor Organ of the holy Ghost.

23. No reformed Synod giues free accesse and a safe Conduſt to their opposites, to heare their Reasons, and so contrarie to reason condemnes them vnheard.

24. Their Synodicall Decrees, even in points of faith (as in the Princes Supreamacie) other Reformed Churches (next dore vnto them) do not admit.

25. The Originalls of the Copies and Decrees of their Councells, and signed by them, no one particular Church, keepeth in the name of the whole.

26. Their *End*, cannot bee to cause a Generall Conformitie of faith thorough out all Christendome, because they vse not the *Meanes*, to wit, to call together the Pastors of the whole Church, and to be all subiect to one Iudge.

27. Their Numbers are, but few, and the Nations that asist them, much lesse: and so respecting the safetie but of the Church of one Natiō, they leaue the rest to the mercie of the rauening Wolues.

28. In the Reformed Church, there is no one *Supream* Iudgment, wherunto all the particular Churches

Churches will submit them selves, besides the Scripture; which is the *law*, not the *Iudge*; nor neuer yet could reconcile hem.

29. In theirs, their Decrees and Resolutions, are neuer admitted (no nor by the simplest swine) but condicionally: viz: so far forth as in his iudgment, they agree with the written word, and so nether haue power to binde, nor engendre any certitude of faith at all.

30. In theirs they teache, that notwithstanding all their endouours, yet still they may erre. How haue they the Holy Ghost then for their Conductor?

31. Lastly, in theirs, taking away one *Soueraigne Iudgment ouer the whole*, to suppress hereſie, they leaue no Iudgment at all ouer any part. *Dixi.*

32. Thus much concerning the *Popes Creed* & the *Decree of the Councell of Trent*, which it selfe might suffice any reasonable man about *Indulgences*. For, if that Councell were a true and lawfull Councell: if the Decrees the of, were the Decrees of the Church and Iudge for the Time, which all good Christians are bound to obey (as I haue proued them to bee) then doth it follow necessarily that this Decree of *Indulgences* (and the like) is a true Orthodox and Canonickall Decree, and consequently, is binding and to bee receiued (vnder the paines specified of all the faithfull.) But to giue the fuller content and to come to the particulars, Sir Humfrey, of your *Via Tuta*, you tell vs, that if we come to examination of witnesses (notwithstanding

standing the Popes Creed, and the Concells Decree) that nether Christ, nor the Primitiue Fathers euer knew, much lesse exercised such Pardons and Indulgences, as are now daylie practised in the Church of Rome.

A N S W E R.

Admit I should grant all you say, what would this helpe you, or what would this hurt vs? Did not the Apostles them selues (those primitiue Fathers) from what they knew as behofull and exercised as wholsome for the itate of that time, both forbid, and by practise forbear, the eating of *Black Puddings* or things itra gled in their blood? Dorth your English Reformed Church, which hath reduced all things to the Practise of the pure word, and Primitiue and most pure times, obserue precisely this Primitiue practise? Or will you censure this to be an impious and corrupt practise? If not, if not withstanding it were practised in Christ and the Apostles times, if not withstanding it be found in the writté word (your *sole Rule*) if not withstanding it were practised in the primitiue Fathers times, if not withstanding all this, you and yours haue left off, and quite annuld this laudable and pious practise, and yet do well and laudable therein, do al things according to the word of God and primitiue practise, why may not we much better practise some such Indulgences which nether Christ nor the Primitiue Fathers euer knew, sith wee lay not away, sith we disallow not all Indulgences, sith by your owne confession, some Indulgences were

were in practise in the Primitive times, but only such as are practised at this present in the Church of Rome. So that this seemes to be only a pleasure you take, to talke of, and often repeate the words *Primitive Times*, *Primitive Fathers*, *Primitive Practise*, and the like, when yet notwithstanding your present proceedings no more resembles the *Primitive Practise* in this point, then a *Pudding*, doth a *Primrose*. But to proceed.

Sir Humfrey pag. 219.

In the primitive Church, when the Christians had committed any capitall and haynous offence, for feare of persecution, ether in deniall of their faith, or in Sacrificing vnto Idols, the parties were inioyned a seuerer and long penance: the rigour of this punishment, the Bishops and the Pastors of their seuerall congregations, had power (if they saw cause) to mitigate at their discretion: which mitigation or relaxation or punishment, was called by the name of *Pardon*, or *Indulgence*. This Doctrine was deriued from *S. Paul*, who released the Incestuous *Corinthian* from the bond of Excommunication, vpon his humiliation and serious repentance: and writes vnto the *Corinthians* that they should do the like, and receiue him againe to their Communion, lest hee should be swallowed vp with immoderat griefe. And this maner of *Indulgence*, was ancient, and continued long in the primitive Church: and of this there is no question.

A N S W E R.

1. Did it so, *Sir Humfrey*? Was this doctrine deriued from *S. Paul*? was this maner of Pardon or *Indulgence* very *ancient*? did it *continue long in the Primitiue Church*? & is there now *no question of it*? How *proue* you that? What are your *groundes* and *realons* for it? If the *Pope* may not by his *Creed*, nor the *Councell of Trent* by her *Decree*, exercise *Indulgences*, which *nether Christ*, nor the *Primitiue Fathers* *euer knew*, how may you, or your *Church*, by your new *Protestant Creed*, and *Parlamentall Decree*, omit the exercise of those *Indulgences*, which were *Deriued* from *Saint Paul*; were *verie Ancient*; *continued long in the Primitiue Church*, and *knownen* ether to *Christ* him selfe, or his *Apostles* and *Primitiue Fathers*? This by your *leau*e, is a question worth the *scanning*, and which wee may not *slubber ouer* in so *slender* a maner; yea, it is as *requisite*, that you should *render vs* a *realon* for your *Omission* of the one, as we you a *realon* for our *Addition* of the other, without so much as *offering* you any maner of *iniurie*.

2. But because you haue here againe got the *Wolfe* by the eare, and houlding it betwixt your *fearfull* and *trembling* teeth, haue not *leasure* to *tell* your owne tale, I, for once will *tell* it for you, that so the *Reader* may see, what your owne *English Mother* sayes of the matter; who in her booke of *Common Prayer*, and *Tract of Communion*, *deliuers* thus her owne *cōfution*. *Brotheren*,
in the

in the Primitiue Church, there was a Godlie Discipline, that at the beginning of Lent, such persons as were notorious sinners, were put to open Penance, and punished in this World, that their soules might be saued in the day of the Lord; and that others admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend. In the steed wherof, vsill the said Discipline may bee restored againe (which thing is much to be wished) it is thought good, that at this time in your presence, be read the generall sentence of Gods cursing against impenitent sinners &c. Weigh and Consider well, I pray you, the words of this confession. 1. That this Discipline was, in the Primitiue Church. 2. That it was a Godly Discipline. 3. That it had for its end, the punishment of men in this World, that their soules might be saued in the day of the Lord. 4. And lastly, that your Reformed Church is without it; and therefore greatly wisheth the restoring thereof. Therefore your Reformed Church is without that Discipline of Penance (and consequently of Indulgence) which was in the Primitiue Church: without that Discipline, which she acknowledged for Godlie Discipline: without that Discipline which had for its end, the punishment of men in this World, that their soules might be saued in the day of the Lord: and all this by your owne Churches free confession. What say you to this? What answer make you? How excuse you the matter? Did I not tell you, you had taken the Wolfe by the care? You who lately could vs, that notwithstanding the Popes Creed and the Councils Decree, it will

be found, that neither Christ, nor the Primitive Fathers, euer knew, much lesse exercised, such Pardons and Indulgences, as are now practised in the Church of Rome, and on the other side, that the mitigation or relaxation of punishment called Indulgences, was, ancient and continued long in the primitive Church, tells vs now ingeniouslye without coaction, or compulsion, that, that godly Discipline, which was in the Primitive Church, which had for its end the saving of mens soules, which the ancient Fathers both knew and exercised, you are vtterly destitute and deprived of it. What a strang Reformed (or rather Deformed) confession call yee this? What a madde Safe Way, to addresse erring men into the Primitive paths? But once againe of curtesie, loosing you from the Wolfe, lets walke a long on your crabbed Way.

Sir Humphrey pag. 220.

The Indulgence in the Roman Church, is, an Absolution from the guilt of Temporall punishment, by the application of the merits of Christ and his Saints, which merits are tearmed, *The-saurus Ecclesie*, *The Treasure of the Church*: and this common Treasurie or Satisfaction, is applyed to dead soules burning in Purgatorie; Thus Indulgences, which were first vled for mitigation of punishments, are now reduced to priuat satisfactions: and that which was formerly left to the discretion of euery Bishop in his owne Diocesse, to dispense with *Summum Ius* (the extremity of the law)

law) is now transferred wholie to the power and authoritie of the Pope, nor that only for some few yeares imprisonment in this life, but for thousands yeares in Purgatorie after death.

A N S W E R.

1. You told vs before, that there were *Pardons and Indulgences* in the Primitiue Church, and that they continued long therein. 2. You tell vs here, that the *Indulgence* in the Roman Church, is an *absolution* from the guilt of temporall punishment, by the application of the merits of Christ and his Saints. 3. That they are termed, *The Treasure of the Church*. 4. That this common *Treasurie* of Satisfaction, is applied to dead soules burning in Purgatorie: all this, I trow, is your owne tale. But tell vs now, sith you freely confesse, that there were *Pardons and Indulgences* in the Primitiue Church, from what, I pray, was their *Absolution*? Was it not from temporall paine? What, I pray, was their *Application*? Were they not the merits of Christ and his Saints? Or can you tell vs what better value they could applie to such a soare? What was the name or title of that *Treasure*? Was it not termed the same that ours is, to wit; *The Treasure of the Church*? Who euer heard a wise man tell such an idle tale? But which yet administers more matter of admiration, who euer heard of dead soules burning in Purgatorie? For if they be dead, then are they insensible: if they be insensible, then how burns they? Or how is that *Treasure* applied to

loules insensible? Surely, *Sir Humfrey*, you had neede of a pill to purge your braine, for feare lest shortly it become insensible, who tell vs a tale, euen so contrary to your owne Religion and common Reason and in steed of dispraising or opposing, greatlie applauding your aduersaries profession.

2. But to take no aduantage of your Barbarismes. What say you to the Churches Treasure? Hath she one, yea, or no? Doth it consist of the merits of Christ and of his Saints, yea, or no? Is this Treasure? Are these merits communicable to the faithfull, yea, or no? Are they satisfactorie, yea, or no? Was this Doctrine known to Christ, and the Primitive Fathers, yea, or no? Was it put in paradise, and exercised by them, yea, or no? Speake out, I pray you, plainly and distinctly, that so the World may know that it is *Sir Humfrey* him selfe, that great Lay-Champion of the English Church, who returnes an answer; he who will make the World to know, how worthely he vindicates his Mothers cause, and his owne reputation. If they be communicable, how may not the Church distribute them according to the necessitie of the faithfull? If not communicable, how say you, and how professe you in your Creed, to beleue the Communion of Saints? Lord how slenderly, Lord how poorely do you dispute? What vse at last will you leaue vnto vs of the merits of Christ and of his Saints, if they be not dispensatorie, if they be not applicatorie, if they be not communicatorie vnto the

the faithfull? Nay, how throw you not your owne two Sacraments quite away, if the *merits of Christ* be not applyed by them? Why Crosse you not that Article out of your Creed, if the *merits of the Saints*, be not *applicatorie*, or *communicatorie*? Or what of the Saints, is communicated to vs, if not their merits?

3. But perhaps to helpe your selfe at a dead list, you will say *first*, that though the merits of Christ and his Saints be *Communicatorie*, yet that it is superstitious to apply them to one, for the paines of a hundred, to another of two, and to a third for a thousand, or ten thousand yeares pardon. But this obiection (if we respect the infinite riches of this Treasure, and how inexhaustible it is) is easily answered; for (not speaking at all of the merits of Saints) euen those of Christ alone, are inexhaustible, so that take out as many hundred thousands as you will, and that for one man alone, that Treasure which still is left behinde, is inconsumptible and inexhaustible. If so, if the Church can, and did in the primitive times, dispose of this most rich and pretious Treasure, then might she confer to euery one, such grace, when, to whom, and in what measure she iudged meete. Again, if she could impose seauen yeares painfull Penance for one mortall sinne (as plainly appeareth by the Ancient Canons that she did.) If one man alone may comit a hundred mortall sinnes or more in a day, if you be expert in the art of Arithmatique, tell me, I pray you to how many thousands that doth

amount? Now the Church can apply the merits of Christ and his Saints to this penitents malady, or she cannot. The paines due to this parties sinnes are more in number, then the merits of Christ and his Saints, are in valew, or they are not. That she can; your selfe, haue confessed, saying. *In the Primitive Church, When the Christians had committed any capitall ctyme, &c. the parties were enioyned a seuerer and long Penance, the rigour wherof the Pastors had power, if they saw cause, to mitigate at their discretion.* Therefore you cannot deny the sequel, that they might relaxe or remit the rigour for whole hundreds, or thousands yeares pardons, if they saw cause. Vnlesse you will say, that man can commit, more then God remit; or that the Treasure of Christs merits is not sufficient to quitte so great and greuous a score, which may, without sinne, be censured blasphemie to imagine.

4. But seeing this shift will not serue, you will say next, that though the merits of Christ and his Saints, may be communicated to the liuing, yet can they not be so to the dead, because *in hell there is no redemption.* But to this I answer, as easilie as to the former. If this be so, to what purpose then, Christ being dead in body, did he descend in soule to them in hell? How singe you then in your English psalmes?

*His soule did after this descend,
Into the lower parts,
To them, that long in darknesse were,
The true light of their harts.*

How

How beleue you then with *S. Mathe* (27. 52.) That Christ entring into that obscure and infernall prison, in virtu of his presence, *many bodies of Saints which slept, arose, and came out of the graues, and appeared to many?* How beleue you that of *S. Luc*, laying, *that he was a light to them that sit in darkenesse, and in the shadowe of death, to direct their feete into the way of peace?* How beleue you that of *1. Pet. 3. 18.* laying. *Being put to death in the flesh, but quickned by the spirit, by which also he went and preached vnto the spirits in prison?* How beleue you that of *S. Paul* (that great Apostle taken vp into the third heauen) laying *1. Cor. 15. 29.* *Otherwise what shall they doe, that are baptised for the dead?* Some merits, some satisfactorie paines, done by the liuing, were doutlesse imparted by way of suffrage to the dead, else *S. Paul* spake most improperly. And that the sacred scripture vseth this word, in this very sence, Christ him selfe shall be my warrant saying. *I haue to be Baptised with a Baptisme, and how am I straitned vntill it be dispatched?* *Luc. 12. 50.* signifying by that word (twice repeated) the paines, the dolours, and death he was to suffer. Which being so, the phrase of the holy Ghost (to be *Baptised for the dead*) must needs insinuat, that euen in *S. Pauls* and the Apostles times Penances, and other painefull and satisfactorie workes, were suffered, and offered vp to God by the liuing, for, and in the behalfe of the departed. How beleue you that of the *Machabes* (2. Machab. 12. 44.) of a holie Priest gathering twelue thousand

land drachmes of siluer amongst the people, sending the same to the Temple of Ierusalem and to the priests there, to haue the soules of those that were slaine to be praied for? Where, not to insist vpon the *greatnes* of the *Almes*, or Collectiō made, the *Multitude* of the people consenting and Contributing, the *Reception* thereof by the Priests of the Temple, and their Aduowing of the fact, for an *holy and good cogitation*, making it cleare, that though many things in that booke were granted Apocripha (as you pretend) yet this particular and religious fact, was as *Canonicall* and aduowable as any other truth containd in scripture, can you deny that euen *Saint Austen* himselfe in those most pure and primitiue times, accounted this booke for *Canonicall*? Or haue you any expresse scripture to proue the contrarye, you who admit no other Rule for the vphoulding of your late new coyned, and Reformed Religion? Lastly, how beleeue you that of Iohn 11. 22. *Martha* saying. Lord if thou hadst bene here my brother had not bene dead: but I know, that euen now, whatsoeuer thou wilt aske of God, God will giue it thee. Marke once againe, the phrasis of the holy Ghost, that now, whatsoeuer thou wilt aske of God. Now thou aliuie, aske of God for my brother dead. Which how could she euer speake, or the holy Ghost euer penne, if the prayers and merits of the liuing, might not be imparted and applyed by way of Suffrage, to the departed? It is cleare therefore, *Sir Humfrey*, notwithstanding what you say to the contrary, that this
faith

faith and doctrine of the Popes Creed, & the Council of Trents Decree, touching the application of the merits of Christ to the soules in Purgatorie, was not so vnknownen, nether so strange to him nor them, as you would make the world beleue: and that *Indulgences* & the application of the merits of Christ and his Saints to soules disceased, hath more frendes and testimonies in holy scripture, then a man would imagine. If the merits of the head be Dispensatory, be Applicatory, be Communicatorie, then doubtles, those also of the body, Christ the head, and the Church his Body, making but one perfect and mysticall man, as S. Paul assureth, Ephes. 4. 11.

Sir Humfrey pag. 222.

These and the like *Indulgences*, were trayned vp in the schoole of Demetrius, which brought no small benefit to the Pope and Cleargie. And therefore, in former times, long before *Luthers* dayes, by the relation of *Thomas Aquinas*, some were of opinion (as *Greg. of Valentia* affirmeth) that Ecclesiasticall Indulgence of it selfe, could remit no punishment. *Nec in foro Ecclesie, neque in foro Dei*: nether in the iudgment of the Church, nor in the iudgment of God: but that it was a pious kind of fraud, whereby the Church, by promising such remission, might allure men to the deuout performance of those pious workes, which were required in the forme of the Indulgence. Euen as a Mother, when she moueth a little childe to runne by promising him an Aple, notwithstanding, after ward she doeth not giue it him.

AN-

A N S W E R.

1. The monie giuen, is not the price of the *Indulgence*, but an Almes to the poore. Touching the benefit it brought to the Pope and Cleargie, you barely say it, you proue it not. But say it did: they who Minister at the Altar, may they liue of the sacrifice yea, or no? Might the Pope and cleargie enioy this benefit, yea, or no? If yea, why carpe you, why caull you at the Pope and Cleargie? If no, why do your owne Cleargie men yet enioy the benefit of such Donations euen to this day? Why cast they them not away, or distribute and impart them amongst the poore, which were first fouled to such a bootlesse and superstitious purpose? Or rather why do you not cast Salt vpon the instead of seed, that they neuer beare corne more? The answer is at hand (as I haue told you already) then many of them, their wiues and their brats, might goe begge their bread.

2. But to come to that of *S. Thomas*, cited by *Greg. of Valentia*, that Ecclesiasticall Indulgence of it selfe, could remit no punishment, nether in the iudgment of the Church, nor in the iudgment of God, but that it was a pious kinde of fraud, and the like: and that this was the opinion of some long before *Luthers* dayes. Who I pray, *Sir Humfrey*, were these some? They were some heretiques surely (such as *Luther*) else neuer would you haue concealed their names. The Prophet *Dauid* saith. *The foole hath said in his hart there is no God.* Some such fooles then there were

were then long before *Luthers* dayes: but what inferre you vpon such a *some*? Ergo there is no God at all. Ergo it was a pious kind of fraude to keepe the simple people in feare with all? Lord how poorelie you despute! Lord how lamentable you seeke to deceiue!

3. But not to let you slip, and to fetch you vpon the point of a Spurre, that I thinke will prick and make you gallop, pacing (as you suppose at your pleasure) in this plaine, *Safe*, and easie *Way*: will you belecue, will you admit an honest mans testimonie in this case, if he be iudged for such, even by no other then by your selfe? Then heare no other but your selfe thus speaking, and refuting the foolish opinion of those namelesse *some*, you spoke of before *Luthers* dayes. In the *Primitive Church*, when the Christians had committed any capitall crime, &c. the parties were inioyned a seuer and long Penance: the rigour wherof the Pastors had power to mitigate at their discretion: and was called by the name of Pardons and Indulgences. This doctrine was deriued from *S. Paul* &c. and this continued long in the *Primitive Church*: and of this there is no question; Thus (though more briefly) the words of *Sir Humfrey*. But the same man findes, long before *Luthers* dayes some of opinion that Ecclesiasticall Indulgence, of it selfe, could remit no punishment, neither in the iudgement of the Church, nor in the iudgment of God, but that it was a pious kinde of fraude, and as a cosoning trick of a Mother, promising an Aple to a childe to make him runne, but afterwards not performing

forming her promise. Ergo the seuerè Penance in-
ioyned by the Pastors in the primitiue Church, in
the opinion of *some* before *Luther* (belike Reform-
ed Protestants) could remit no punishment at
all, nether in the iudgement of the Church,
not in the iudgement of God. Ergo this do-
ctrine deriued from *Saint Paul* and the Primitiue
Church, was a pious kinde of fraud, Was a colo-
ning trick of a Mother, promising her childe an
Aple to make him runne, but afterwards sayling
of her promise: and of this there is no question.
*Qui risistis, & nunc ridete. Et qui nunquam risistis,
nunc ridete.* You that laugh, laugh also now; And
yvu that neuer laughed in all your life, laugh now.
Or rather weepe to see such wofull disputants in-
termedling with matters which belong not to
them, and far surpasse the reach and compasse of
their capacities, as this, and all the rest of this na-
ture, *Sir Humfrey*, doth yours, and myne.

Sir Humfrey pag. 223.

Now will I proceed to the publication of wit-
nesses, whereby it shall appeare by the euidence
of their owne learned men, that this point of faith
hath no more Antiquiry, and Consent of Fathers
and Schoolmen in the Roman Church, then the
Articles before confessed.

Then name you *Durandus*, *Siluester Prierias*, *Maïor*,
Bishop Fisher of *Rocheſter*, *Alphonſus a Caſtro*, *Anto-
ninus*, *Cardinall Caſetan*, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, *Echius*
(who wrote against *Luther*) *Tecelinus*, and *Cunerus*.

A N-

A N S W E R.

All these authorities, *Sir Humfrey*, being only *Eleuen* in Number, for the reasons following, I let passe, not houlding them worth the while, ether to examine, or to answer. 1. For that they are not testimonies in all Ages, from our Saviour vnto vs, which the number of *Eleuen* can not supply. 2. For that they are not deduced (as I lately tould you) *in directa linea*, in a direct line, according both to our expectation, and your owne confession. 3. For that they are all Massing Priests, visible professors of our Church, and not of yours: not one of them any better Protestant then the Pope of Rome: where the Iesuits Challenge exacts of you, that you, or any of your friendes, should produce the visible Professors of your owne. 4. For that the greater number euen of these *Eleuen* Professors named by you, as *Siluester Prierias*, *Bishop Fisher*, *Alphonsus a Castro*, *Cardinall Caietan*, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, *Eckius*, *Tecelius*, and *Cunerus*, liued all of them since *Luther*; where you were vrged to produce those visible Professors, especially which liued in the Ages before *Luther*, so that taking away these, you haue but only three left (and those also but of late standing) to supplie all the Ages from Christ to vs. 5. Should I examine euery one of them, from first to last particularly, all the doubts can be gathered from them, I can make your selfe to Answer. Take which of them you please a part, or
take

take them all together, and when you haue read them, reade but your selfe, pag. 219. 220. and all will ether vanish into smoke, or your selfe be contrary to your selfe, and to the testimonies produced by you. 6. And lastlie, it is quite and cleane from the state of the questton, which vrgerh, which exacteth, which presseth, you to produce the *Persons* of your Professors, not the points of your profession. Your *faithfull*, your *beleeuers*, not your faith, not your beliefe without any faithfull or beleeuers. Your *Witnesses*, not the writings without the witnesses. Your Catalogue of *Names*, your *Butterie Booke*, shewing, *Where was your Church before Luther?* and how you succeeded one another, *Orderly, Successiuelly, and Interruptedly* from Christ to vs. I say *Orderly*, vnder lawfull guides and Pastors. *Successiuelly* from hand to hand. *Interruptedly*, without fraction or Cessation. *Protestant* fully and perfectly in all points, *vnanimously* without Disunion, *Distinct* from that of Rome without leaning, without depending, without being imaginarily imbreasted within the bosome of any Church, suspected of the least spot in matter of faith.

2. This, *Sir Humfrey*, till you performe, turne and winde your selfe, *Camelion* like, into a thousand colours. Prescribe vnto vs a thousand *Wayes*. Write a thousand *Bookes*. Cast a thousand doubts, and set a thousand Controuerxies on foote all at once, if so you please, yet will you neuer stop Papists mouths, nor euer satisfie Protestants consciences,

to crie vnto you as long as the world lasts, your Catalogue Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, especially sith your selfe-freely and without constraint confesse Epist. Ded. pag. 3. It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages. Especially sith he who telleth vs, that heaven and earth shall faile, before one iot or title of his word faile till al be fulfilled, assureth vs, And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the Ministrie, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith and knowledge of the Sonne of God into a perfect man: into the measure of the Age of the fulnes of Christ; that now we be not children wa- uering, and carried about with euery winde of doctrine in the wickednesse of men, in craftines to the circum- uention of error: but doing the truth in charitie, let vs in all things grow in him which is the head, Christ. Lo our expresse and ample warrant from Gods word. If we will not be children; if we will not be wa- uering; if we will not be carried about with euery wind of doctrine (without Doctors:) if we will keepe our selues secure from the wickednes of men, and from the craftines and circumuention of error, we must according to the Apostles counsell, inseparably (whether by life or death) cleaue and adhere to that Church to which God gaue some Apo- stles, some Prophets, other some Euangelists, and other-

some Pastors and Doctors, to continue from thence to the end of the worlde. Which saide, I will not bee myne owne iudge, nor needeth there ought but an vpright man and of common reason to discerne, whether the Apostle hath not depicted *Sir Humfrey* to the life, who endeouours nothing more then to carrie vs about with the Winde of his *Doctrins*, neuer producing his Protestant Apostles, Prophets, Euangelists, Pastors and Doctors: and so make vs *children*: to make vs *wa- uering* with euery Winde: and to carrie vs a great way about by sundry dangerous, Crooked and vncertaine *Wayes*, instead of leading vs by that short, sure, certaine and most *Safe way*, prescribed to vs by the Apostle.

SECT. X.

THe Testimonies of our aduersaries, touching the infallible certaintie of the Protestāt faith, and the vncertaintie of the Romish.

A N S W E R.

1. This Title, is the very same in substance, that was prefixed to the precedent Section: and that which is said therein, the same that was said in the former. The points also the same which were so often, and so lately handled: to wit, Merit of workes, Transubstantiation, Priuat Masse, Seauen Sacraments

Sacraments, Communion in one Kind, Prayer in an vnknown tongue, worshiping of Images, and Indulgēces &c. what a laborinth? what a Circle? what a Milhorse, make you, *Sir Humfrey* of your Reader, thus blindly to wheele and reele about, and neuer, to let him come to his wayes end? neuer to set him into that promised *Safe Way*; of *Where was your Church before Luther*? You tell vs one thing too too oftē (most yrksome & tedious to vnderstanding eares) which forces vs to tell you often, that which we desire to haue told you but only once. Our seeking, our enquiring, our calling vpon you for the present is, for a Catalogue of your *faithfull*, not for your *Faith*. For the production of your *Professors*, not for your *Profession*. For the Names of the particulars *Parties*, not for the particular *Points* which they held, or denied: much lesse for the *faithfull professors*, or the particular *Names*, or *persons*, of our profession; which is for vs, not for you to produce, if wee bee vrged therto. Wee cannot with all our Reasons, with all our wit, with all the importunitie, nor with all the prayers we can possibly vse, extort from you, to name vnto vs, so much as one litle Cottage, one litle hole, or one house, for 1500. yeares together before *Luther*, where a man, that was out of his way, might haue addrest him selfe to a Protestants lodging to haue set him into a *Safe Way*. What shall wee do more? What shall wee say more vnto you then wee haue laid before? If you haue Eyes and

will not see: if you haue harts and will not vnderstand: if you haue Eares and will not heare, then may wee cry whilst our hartts ake for your Catalogue, and bee neuer the neere. I will therefore deale with you after another sort concerning this Section, to see if by any meanes wee may ether make you see your owne error, or shew other good people, how slight stufte you bring against vs, which may bee so easilie retorted vpon your selfe and your owne profession.

2. Your *Eight Section* runneth vpon this straine, to proue by the testimony of your aduersaries, the goodnes of your Protestant faith in Generall. This Tenth Section, the vncertainty (and consequently, the badnesse) of the Romish. I will therefore counterpoint you with the like proofes, and proue vnto you, euen by the testimonie of learned Protestants, the goodnes of our Romish Religion in generall, and the badnes of your English. In the defence of our Romish, take the testimonie of no meaner a man then *Luther* him selfe, who thus speaketh of our Church. In the Roman Church is all Christianitie, yea the very kernel of Christianitie Take a second testimonie from *M. Hooker*, laying thus. *The Church of Rome is of the familie of Iesus Christ: a part of the house of God: a lymme of the visible Church of Christ. Ecclesiast. pollicie lib. 3. Section. 1. pag. 130. F. Melon. pag. 714.* Take a third testimonie from *M. Doctor Barrow* in his four sermons and two questions &c. serm. 3. pag. 488. saying thus. *The learned Writers acknowledge*

no Wledg the Church of Rome to be the Church of God. Take a fourth testimonie from Sir Edwin Sandes, (a man often cited by your selfe) in his Relation of Religion &c. where Sect. 48. ex Protelt. Apol. pag. 567. he cōtēsteth that there are in our Religiō, great multitudes of men virtuous and learned, fraught With the loue of God and truth: aboue all things, men of memorable integritie of hart and affection; Whose lues are not deare to them, much lesse their labours to be spent for the good of Gods Church. And some fide of a lease afterwards, he further testifieth thus of our Church. Let the Protestants looke With the eye of Charitie vpon them (of the Papacie) as Well as of seueritie, and they shall find some excellent orders of Gouvernment, some singular helpes for the increase of Godlines and Deuotion, for the conquering of sinne, for the profiting in vertu; And contrary wise in them selues looking With a more single and lesse indulgent eye, they shall find there is no such absolute perfection in their doctrine and reformation. I could produce ten times as many of the like testimonies, but that I will auoide to be tedious, euen of verie learned Protestants, that speake most worthely in the praise of our Roman Religion: but for the present let these suffice.

3. Now to giue you the like testimonies of such as speake euil, of your Reformed Religion, take for the first your owne Luther affirming thus. They are seauen times worse vnder the name of Christian libertie, then when they were vnder the Pope. Luther in postil, euang. dom. primæ

Take for a second testimonie Erasmus, who of the same Religion saith thus. *Bring me one Whom this gospel hath, of a glutton, made sober; of fierce, mild; of couetous, liberall; of an ill speaker, Well spoken; of an vnchast, shamfast; I can shew them many Who are made worse then they were.* Erasmus epist ad Vult. Take for a third testimonie, M. Richard Ieffrey, in his sermon preached at Pauls 7. of October 1604. saying thus. *I may freely speake, What I haue plainly seene in the course of some trauels, and obseruation of some courses, that in Flanders, Was neuer more drunkennes; in Italie, more Wantones &c; in Iurie more hypocrysie; in Turkie, more impietie, in Tartarie, more iniquitie, then is practised generally in England, ex Prot. Apol. pag. 589.* Take for a fourth testimonie, the Puritans words alleaded by M. Poewel, in his booke of things indifferent &c. pag. 136. ex eodem, saying. *What eye so blind, that it doth not gush out With teares, to behould the miserie of our supposed glorious Church, I meane, the great ignorance, the superficiall worship of God, the fearefull blasphemies and swearings in houses, and streetes &c. the dishonor of superiors; the pride, crueltie, fornications, adulteries, drunkennes, couetousnes, vsurie, and other like abominations &c. O behould and pittie, the wofull and lamentable estate of our Church in these things!*

4. And to shew that this complaint is not only in, and for matters of fact, but much more for matter of faith, take for a fift testimonie, the words of the learned Puritans, cited by M. Rogers in his Preface, saying thus. *The points (we dissent in) are*
of

of such importance, as if euery haire of our heads were a life, we ought to afford them in defence of these matters. And pag. 10. The controuersie betwixt them and vs, is not (as the Bishops and their Well Willers would beare the world in hand) for a Cappe, a Tippet or a Surplesse, but for greater matters, concerning a true Ministrie and regiment of the Church, according to the word: the one wherof, that is, a true Ministrie, we shall neuer haue, till Archbishops, and Bishops be put downe. And pag. 13. they further say. Our controuersie is, whether Iesw Christ shall be King. or no. With more of this nature already rehearced, wherto I remit you. Now this premised, how easie is it euen for a child, to retort the rest of your words vpon your selfe?

Sir Humfrey pag. 233.

1. It cannot be denied, that the Popes (the Protestant) sworne seruants, our sworne enemies, their best witnesses, and our worst accusers, haue testified these things, both against them selues, and in behalfe of our doctrine. And howsoeuer they excuse the matter, yet sure I am, they are diuided amongst them selues, and consequently, want another speciall mark of their Church, which is vnitie in points of faith. And then repeating the 8. particular points disputed betwixt vs, pag. 239. You conclude thus, If these witnesses had bene ignorant and vnlearned men, or excommunicated persons, in their owne Church; or had they witnessed the truth, concerning Ceremonies, and things doubtful, there might bee some plea, why their testimonies

nies should not be admitted ; But When the points in question, are Articles of their owne Creed, When they are Witnessed by Popes, by Councils, by Cardinals, by Bishops, by learned Doctors, and Scholemen in their owne Church on our behalfe, and against their owne Tenets; I see no cause Why I should not demand judgment in defence of our Church, and tryall of our cause. Thus easilie, with adding the word *Protestants*, instead of *Pope*, is all this triviall stuffe retorted vpon your selfe. All the rest that followes to the end of his Section, is other flight and insufficiēt, stuffe, and so oft repeated by you before, that to refute one of them, is to refute all: wherof beould here an Example.

Sir Humfrey pag. 233.

Totake a short reuiew therfore of our *Aduersaries* confessions touching some chiefe points; First concerninge the doctrine of Merits, they haue confessed, that our Iustification is by faith in Christ Iesus only. They haue confessed, that there is no saluation nor assurance in our owne Merits (true without his) but in the merits of our only Saniour. And in this confession, they intimate the noueltie and incertaintie of their owne doctrine; and in this likewise they acknowledge the Antiquitie and visibilitie of our Church, long before Luthers dayes. And thus you runne on in the selfe same vaine, vpon Transubstantiation, Priuat Masse, the Seauen Sacraments, Communion in one kind, prayer in an vnknowē tongue, worship
of

of Images, Indulgences, and pardons, without so much as altering a word. To all which once for all, thus I answer.

ANSWER.

1. Admit for true all you say concerning vs, to wit, that *in this confession, we intimate the noueltie and vncertainie of our owne doctrine* (which like the burden of some songe or ballad, your repeate without variation, at the end of each of these eight points) admit I say that this were true, yet how followes it, Our doctrine is new, therefore yours is ould? Ours is vncertaine, therefore yours is certaine? Ours is damnable Idolatrie, therefore yours is orthodox veritie? where learned you, *Sir Humfrey*, such kind of Illations? What childe in your owne Religion, or dunse in ours, is notable to discouer this for very slight and insufficient stuffe, such as scarcely deserues any Reply, but rather to bee pittied, or hift out of Christian schooles? Admit, I say, that in this confession, *we intimate the nouelty and vncertainty of our owne doctrine*, how followes it, that we in so doing, *doe likewise acknowledge the Antiquitie and visibilitie of your Church long before Luthers dayes*? For how absurd is it, to admit a substance subsisting (vnles by miracle) without a subiect? Did your doctrine subsist, and no persons subsist which did professe it? Can you tell vs how mens soules subsist in this world visibly, and yet out of visible bodies? Or can you put two soules (one of yours, another of ours) into

into one of our bodies, as you most deceitfully would seeme to inuolue & inbreast, your Church into our bosome?

2. This is the depth *Sir Humfrey* of your profound and inscrutable doctrine, which no man aliue, no nor your selfe that dictates it, can tell how to vnderstand. The Antiquitie and visibilitie of your Reformed doctrine, hath beene in vs and in our bosome, long before *Luthers* dayes, without any person or suppositum of your owne to support it! What shall we say to such impertinent chymericall conceits? Is it worth the while to refute such fables? Trulie no, but to say of them as *Luther* did (the first father of this your Reformed faith; *The arguments and reasonings of the Sacramentaries*, are such vaine words, without wit, that I cannot maruell sufficiently, how learned men can bee moued with such lyes. And truly, they do their matters with so fearfull a conscience, that they seeme to wishe they had neuer take them in hand: verely I suppose, if they were to consult of the matter a fresh, they would neuer begin. Thus *Luther* tom. 7. *Defensio verborum cœna*, fol. 381. And verely I beleue with him, if your English Prelats and Superintendents who now see the impossibilitie there is to fasten in wise mens vnderstandings, such a chymericall Church as you fantasie, were now to consult a fresh of the matter, I beleue verelie they would looke so well to the matter, as wee should neuer catch them in so grosse contradiction. To examine one
more

more of your doughtie conclusions, to make you see, if it be possible, the shallownes of your proceedings. In this Section, repeating againe some of the selfe same points you go foward thus.

Sir Humfrey pag. 241.

Of what strength and force therefore Truth is, it appeares by this, that she extorts a full and ample testimonie of her doctrine, (*Lord, once put in Doctors*) from her sworne enemies. And yet for further prooffe of our cause, I will giue another Summons to the prime men of their Grand Inquelt, who, without partialitie, will testifie in our behalfe, that our Church is built vpon a more stable and sure foundation, then the now Roman Church (*and yet vpon no other then in, & vpon her very Bosome.*) And that our Doctrine (*without any Doctors*) is more frutefull and profitable, and euery way more safe and comfortable for the belief of euery Christian, and the saluation of the beleeuer. *And then you goe forward with the Sacrament of Baptisme, the Sacrament of Matrimonie, the Sacrament of Orders, of which you say there is no certaintie, and consequently no certaintie of Succession in Priesthood which they so much magnifie in their Church. Besides if in the Succession of Popes and Pastors the intention of any one Prielt did fayle, ether in Baptisme or in orders: in all succeeding generations, the Ordination and Consecration both of Priest and people are become viterly voide and of none effect. And with the*
like

like fillie reasons, you make inuualid Baptisme, the Supper, Matrimonie, and many other points of our religion.

A N S W E R.

I. But admit for true what you say, to wit, that if the intention of any one Priest did faile in the Sacrament of Orders, then in all succeeding generations, the Ordination and Consecration both of Priest and people, are utterly void, and of none effect, admit I say, that this be so: you in the ~~meane~~ meane while, pretending all the priestly power which your Bishops haue, to be deriued from the priests and Bishops of the Roman Church, what will followe, but this notable follie, that you haue no Priest at all in your Religion? For you can haue no more certaintie for the Ordination of *yours*, then wee our selues haue for the Ordination of *Ours*: if therefore *Ours* bee vncertaine, and you nether can shew none, nor pretend none out of *Ours*, then *Ours* being vncertaine, *yours* also must needs bee vncertaine. If the intention of him of *Ours*, who you pretend to haue made the first Priest of *yours*, did faile in the first Ordination, then it follows that all *your* Bishops & other pretended Ecclesiasticall Prelats, are no priests at all. If you haue no Priests, you haue nether Sacrifice nor Sacraments; if nether Sacrifice nor Sacraments, no Religion; if no Religion, then are you such as I am Loth to name, but leaue your selfe to coniecture the rest. Lord haue mercie vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs, to see how

how most maliciously you seeke to deceive, and yet performe the same so sensibly! Is this the way to shew, how easie a thing it is for a meane lay man, to proue the visibilitie of Protestant professors, from Christ to Luther? Is this to give an *Essay* of your *rendeuours*? Is this to *vindicate your Mothers cause*, and to maintaine your owne reputation? Is this to *give other Summons* to the prime men of our Grand Inquest? Is this to *extort from vs*, and to make vs testifie in your behalfe, that your Church is built vpon a more stable and sure foundation, then the now Roman Church? Is this to shew your doctrine to be *more fruitfull and profitabable*, and *euery way more safe* and comfortable for the beliefe of euery Christian, and the saluation of the beleuee? Surely no: nothing lesse, for you are so far from performing this, your proofes and reasons are so triuiall, and so easily retorted vpon your selfe, that it seemes in a maner that you were hired, and set of purpose vpon this taske, vtterly to shame & disgrace the Protestant cause, which yet you pretend to propugne.

2. But enough of this; lets a long to your Eleuenth. Meane while, you, who like the Cuckoe haue taught vs to sing one and the selfe same song so often ouer; Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey*, come out with your Catalogue, sith your selfe so plainly tell vs; *It is an vndouted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages.* Sith S. Paul so plainly tels vs. And be

gaue some Apostles, some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Doctors and Pastors &c. to continue vntill we all meete in the vniue of faith &c. Sith the Prophet Isay not without astonishment and wonder at such as you, saith. *Who euer heard such a thing? and who hath seene the like to this &c. Shall not I that make others to bring forth children, my selfe bring forth, saith the Lord? Shall I, that geue generation to others, be barren, saith the Lord thy God?* The very same (Sir Hamfrey) we say to you, hath God made the Church of Rome, the whore of Babilon to bring forth children, and shall not him selfe bring forth by his chaste wife the Protestant Church? Shall he geue generation to that wicked Strumpet, and shall the wombe of your Reformed Mother, be quite barren? *Who euer heard such a thing? and who hath seene the like of this,* but he who saw the woman ashamed to shew her scald head, casting her coates thereon to hide the same, discovered that which was a great deale more shamefull to see?

3. For a surplus of that which hath beene said hitherto, I may not omit to score and Tālie vp, the sundry vnttruths which you haue tould vs in this Section, wherof the first is.

Pag. 131. That it is our Confession, and that we witnesse, *that the principall points of our faith and doctrine, now taught and professed in the Church of Rome* (meane you the Articles of the Apostles Creed, for these I trow are the principall points of our faith and doctrine?) *were not known to for-*

mer Ages. The (70. vnt ruth.)

Pag. 232. That the Church of Rome doth obtrude strange Articles of beliefe vpon her profelites, *Which haue no foundation in the Scriptures, and want vniuersallitie and consent of Fathers. (The 71. vnt ruth.)*

Pag. 233. That it is our confession, that our iustification is by faith in Christ Iesus only, and that there is no saluation nor assurance in our owne meritts. The (72. vnt ruth.)

Ibid. That in this confession we intimate the noueltie and vncertaintie of our owne doctrine, and the Antiquitie and visibilitie of your Church long before Luthers dayes. The (73. vnt ruth.)

In that of pag. 334. about Transubstantiation, there is no lesse then two or three seuerall vnt ruths: but to be sparing, let them make the (74. vnt ruth.)

That of priuat Masse pag. 235. makes the (75. vnt ruth.)

That some of the 7. Sacraments, were not instituted by Christ pag. 236. the (76. vnt ruth.)

That we confesse, all of them are not true and proper Sacraments of the new law, the (77. vnt ruth.)

That we contelle pag 236. that Communion in one kinde. was not practised by the Apostles, nor the Ancient Church, the (78. vnt ruth.)

That we confesse, pag. 217. Prayer in an vknown tongue, not so haue bene vsed in the primitive and ancient Church, the (79. vnt ruth.)

That we confesse that there is no exāple amongst
the

the Fathers for adoration of Images, the (80. vnt ruth.)

That we confesse that the *Indulgences now vsed, haue no authoritie from Scriptures or Fathers, the (81. vnt ruth.)*

That we are vncertaine (pag. 245.) *Whether the Saints do heare our prayers, the (82. vnt ruth.)*

That we are vncertaine, whether some *we pray vnto, be Saints in heauen, or damned with the Diuels in hell, the (83. vnt ruth.)*

That S. Gregorie (pag. 249.) gave the first *Credo to Purgatorie, the (84. vnt ruth.)*

That S. Austen (pag. 250.) held Purgatorie, *as a doubtfull opinion, the (85. vnt ruth.)*

That we teache (pag. 254.) that *Latria*, or diuine honor, by a necessary consequence, is to be giuen Images in plaine deed, the (86. vnt ruth.)
With many more which I omit, would I cast vp the whole account with you rigorously.

Section XI.

THe Testimony of our Adversaries, touching the greater safety, comfort, and benefit of the soule, in the Protestant faith, then in the Romish.

ANSWER.

1. To what purpose repeate you this againe? What writer euer vsed so often, and so needles repetition of one and the same thing? In the Section

tion immediatly going before, you spend the greatest part thereof in this very point, saying thus pag. 241. *I Will giue another Summons to the prime men of their Grand Inquest, Who without partialitie Will testifie on our behalfe &c. that our Doctrine is more fruisfull, and profitable, and euery way more safe and comfortable for the belisfe of euery Christian, then the Romish.* Here (this being a new Section) we expected some new matter, and you come in againe, not with another, but with the selfe same Cuc-koes song, which you had sung to vs so oft before, forlooth, *the Testimonie of your Aduersaries, touching the greater fastie, comfort, and benefit of the soule in the Protestant faish, then in the Romish.* What difference betwixt these two? What trifling is this? What trumperie is this? What spending of Incke and paper in vaine? What else is this but a plaine iugling trick to puzzle the vnderstanding of your vnskilfull and inconsiderat Reader, and to remoue out of his minde the maine, and principall thing which you should proue, to wit; *Where Was your Church before Luther?* You, not able to performe this vndertaken taske, cunningly and craftely, still alter and change the state of the question, and instead of your Protestant Professors which you should produce, come in with your Profession: instead of your Faithfull, come in with your Faith: and instead of the Names of the Parsons or Parties, come in with the Points or Opinions which they beleueed. What pittifull toying is this, with things that are of such importance?

2. Againe in the precedent Section (which you had also done often before) your ranne ouer by name these particulars, to wit, 1. Merit of works. 2. Transubstantiation. 3. Priuat Masse. 4. Communion in both kinds. 5. Prayer in an vnknownen tongue. 6. Worshipping of Images. 7. Inuocation of Saints, And 8. The fallibilitie of the Priests Intention in the Sacraments, And here againe you come in with 1. Transubstantiation of the Sacramentall Bread. 2. The fallibilitie of the Priests Intention. 3. Communion in both kinds. 4. Priuat Masse. 5. Prayer in an vnknownen tongue. 6. Image worshipping. 7. Inuocation of Saints. 8. and Merit of works. If you treat of any other Points in ether of these two Sections, I know not how often you haue had them vp before. What strang wheeling about is this, and yet to stand stil in one and the same place? How vnproperly is your Booke called the *Safe Way*, which brings your Reader into such a wood, as he can neuer come to finde the way he inquiereth for, to wit, the way which should lead him to know; *Where your Church was before Luther?*

3. Moreouer, the Testators, whose Testimony you haue named both in this and the precedent Section, ar these that follow. 1. *Cardinall Bellarmine*. 2. *Gabriel Biel*. 3. *Peter Lombard*. 4. *Cardinall Caietan*. 5. *S. Austen*. 6. *Cassandre*. 7. *Dominicus à Soto*. 8. *Cardinall Caietan*. 9. *Sir Thomas Moore* and *Bishop Fisher* who shed their blood to oppose a principall point of your Religion. 10. *Pope Gregoris* the great 11. venerable *Bede Monke* 12. *Durandus*.

13. Gerson. 14. Tharrasius Patriarch of Constantinople. 15. S. Thomas of Aquin, a Dominican Friar. 16. S. Bonaventure, a Franciscan Friar. 17. Suarez, and Vasques both Iesuits. 18. Iacobus de Grapbys. 19. S. Antoninus a Friar, 20. Gregorie of Valencia a Iesuit 21. Canus a Dominican. 22. Alexander de Hales 23. The Councell of Trent. 24. Doctor Harding. 25. Pope Pius the secōd. 26. Panormisā Abbot. 27. Lyrā. 28. The Rhemists. 29. Erasmus. 30. S. Bernard Abbot. 31. And Friar Walden. Now what apparance that these were Protestants? Who euer heard tell of Popes, Cardinalls, Abbots, Monkes, Friars, Iesuits, with such a rable of ranke Papists, to be reputed for reformed Protestants? Nay, amongst Thirtie od seuerall Authors that are here named, what one of them all dare you, Sir Humfrey, challenge to be a perfect Protestant according to the 39. Articles of your Reformed Religion? Or, as I haue often tould you, Protestant *fully*, in all points; *purely*, without admixtion of damnable error; that truly Reformed *Sister*, which kept her *first* faith wholly vnspotted? You dare not name one: you dare not so much as to Challenge one: How haue you then satisfied the Iesuits Challenge; That Sir Humfrey, or his friends, should proue out of some good Authors, that the Protestant Church was in all ages visible, especially in the Ages before Luther? Were these men of the Protestant Church, or of the Papist? Do not your selfe cite them as professed enemies of your profession? Did not diuers of them labour and sweat to refute your heresie? Did not diuers

of them shed their blood to oppose your Religion at its first arising? Did you not (to vse your owne flanting flourish) ride your horses vp to the bridles, in the blood of Bishop *Fisher*, Sir *Thomas Moore*, & Father *Campion*, men often named by your selfe in this you dissembled *Safe Way*? And will you make the world so blinde, as to thinke that your predecessors before *Luther*, were euer lodged, or euer in breasted in these mens bosomes?

4. Lord haue mercy vpon vs, Christ haue mercy vpon vs, Lord haue mercy vpon vs, to thinke that there should be any in the world of so poore capacitie, as to suppose, that Sir *Humfrey*, with his trifling *via Tuta*, had ether satisfied the consciences of iudicious Protestants, or stop the mouthes of any Papists? Verely Eyes they haue and see not, Eares they haue and heare not, their foolish hart is blinded, that plainly confesse it for an vndouted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages: that finde in Gods word, in such expresse and plainetearmes; And he gaue some Apostles, some Prophets, and othersome Euangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue till we all meete in the vniity of faith. Ephes. 4. 11. and yet cannot shew vs, so much as one litle Cottage, or one litle hole, where one only Protestant lodged in all the world, for a thousand or fiftene hundred yeares together before *Luther*! I say, one only, Distinct from that of ours, Protestant Fully in all points, Purely without any mixture of Ro-

mish

mish errors, *Orderly* vnder lawfull Pastors, *Successively* in a direct line, *Perpetually* without interruption, *Vniformly* with full consent amongst themselves. In a word, so, as that the *first* was a true *Apostle*, the *last* a *Protestant*, after the present French or English cut. These are the conditions which we require, conditions (as the Logician speaketh) *sine qua non*: without the which, all your reading, all your writing, all your disputing, is nothing, but deceitfull turning and winding, nothing but malicious and wilfull wrangling, and lastly, nothing but plaine and palpable tergiversation from the state of the question; *Where was your Church before Luther?*

5. Briefly therefore, to shut vp this *Section*, and that in generall tearmes, without touching the particulars (which haue already bene so oft repeated) I will insist only vpon the Two first lines thereof, the which are these.

Sir Humfrey pag. 257.

From the *Certaine Way*, I will proceede to the *Easier Way*.

A N S W E R.

1. From this Confession, and the like repeated in sundry places else where, and from the very *Title* of your whole Booke, I argue thus.

That is the most *Certaine* and *Safest Way* vnto saluation, which *Sir Humfrey* supposeth in his *via Tuta*.

But *Sir Humfrey*, in his *via Tuta*, supposeth all

Protestants, for whole fiftene hundred yeares from Christ to *Luther*, to haue bene inbreasted in the bosome of the Roman Church.

Ergo to haue beene alwayes ipbreasted in the bosome of the Roman Church, is not only the *Certaine*, but the *Safest Way* vnto saluation.

6. And thus whatsoeuer you haue said, or can say, against the faith or doctrine of the Catholique Roman Church, is all vn said in this very Sillogisme: and the very Title of your Booke, hath quite ouer-turned all the contexture which you so toylefully and wastly haue wouen together against that insuperable & irresistible Rock. Hence forward therfore (in imitation of you) *Luthers* profession, shall be my confession, saying; *The Arguments and Reasons of the Sacramentaries*, are such vaine wordes without wit, that I cannot maruell sufficiently, how learned men can be moued with such lyes; And truly, they do their matters with so fearfull a conscience, that they seeme to wishe they had neuer taken them in hand. Verely I suppose, if they were to consult of the matter a fresh, they would neuer begin. Thus *Luther* tom. 7. *Defensio verborum cœna*, fol. 138.

Section XII.

Our Aduersaries conuicted by the euident testimonies (87. vntruth) of the Ancient Fathers, either ridiculously elude them, or plainly reiect the.

A N-

A N S W E R.

1. Strang that we should ether be convicted by them, ether elude them, or reiect them, when we only, and none but we, haue euer preserued them, euer defended them, and euer maintained them against all heretiques. But strangest of all it is, that they should stand in the defence of Protestants, and the defiance of vs, when the best and learnedst Protestants, speake so contemptible, and irrespectiue of them, and we so greatly honor and reuerence them. To instance this in the very words of sundry prime and principall Protestants, *Luther* affirmeth; The Fathers of so many ages to haue bene plainly blinde, and most ignorant in the Scriptures. To haue erred all their life time. And that vnlesse they were amended before their deaths, they were nether Saints, nor pertayning to the Church. Tom. 3. Wittenb. anno 1551. de lib. arbit. pag. 434. And speaking of sundry Fathers in particular, he further saith. In the writings of *Hierom*, there is not a word of true faith in Christ, and sound Religion. *Tertullian*, is very superstitious. I haue holden *Origen*, long since accursed. Of *Chrysostome*, I make no account. *Basil* is of no worth, he is wholly a Monke, I weigh him not a haire. *Cyprian* is a weake Diuine. *Gregory* was deceived by the Deuil. The same *Luther* further saith. I care not if a thousand *Austins*, a thousand *Cyprians*, and a thousand Churches stood against me,

2. *Caluin* saith, that the Fathers were generally carried away in error. *Beza* saith, that they followed Paganisme for a Rule. *Causens* saith, that *S. Dionysius*, was a doting dreamer. *S. Clement*, a spreadder of drosse and dregges. *S. Ignatius*, an idle trifler. Others tearme *S. Irenæus*, a fantastickall writer. *S. Cyprian*, blockish and reprobate. *S. Nazianzen*, a babler. *S. Ambrose*, bewitched by the deuill. *S. Hierom* no lesse damned then Lucifer. All which is to be found in the Confutation of *M. Rider* by Father *Fitzsimons* in the Table and title, *Fathers* with a great deale more which I omit for breuitie sake.

3. But to leaue *Luther*, *Caluin*, *Beza* and others, as being strangers, and to speake a litle of our owne English Authors, *M. Cartwright* saith, that seeking, in the Fathers, is a rakeing in ditches, and summoning of hell. That they imagined fondlie. That *Clement*, *Anaclete*, and *Anicete*, are discharged for Rogues, and for men burnt in the foreheads. That *Damasus* spoke in the Dragons mouth. And that *Ignatius* the martyr, was a Counterfet: all to be seen at larg in the aforesaid Confutatioⁿ of *M. Rider*, to which the Table will direct you. And else where he further saith, that to allow *S. Augustine*, is to bring in Poperie againe. Prot. Apol. pag. 116.

4. *S. Ierom* is reiected by *M. Fulke* Prot. Apol. pag. 85. *S. Gregoris*, by *Iohn Bale* ibid. pag. 166. *M. Whitakers* afflicmeth, the Popish religion, to be a patched couerlet of the Fathers errors, sowed together, ibid. pag. 128. Doctor *Whitgift* preferreth

Prota-

Protestant Bishops, before all the Bishops that euer were. *ibid.* pag. 407. Master Walker in his Fishers Follie, pag. 8. saith. We do not regard in a controuerted point of faith, what any Father or Doctor doth hould, or hath held in former ages. D. Reynolds sleigheth and reiecteth the testimonies of S. Cyprian, S. Leo, S. Hierom, S. Chrysostome, Maximus; Isidore, and Theodoret (*Antid.* pag. 230.) saying. Father Maximus did dote. Isidore, ouershot him selfe. Theodoret serued his owne cause. S. Gregorie Knew not what he said. Reynolds. cap. 4. deuif. 3. fol. 132. Doctor Humfrey tearmeth S. Greg. the first leader of the popish danse. Iesuitif. 2. part. pag. 6. 4. M. Iewell censureth S. Basil of lack of iudgement. pag. 196. cited by D. Harding. Detection pag. 325. M. Horne Bishop of Winchester, tearmeth S. Augustine our Apostle, *A blind buzzard*, against M. Fecknam pag. pag. 58. And M. Iewell calleth him, *an hypocrite, a superstitious man, cruell, bloodie, and proud aboue measure.* Iewell pag. 185. Now was it euer read, or euer heard, that Catholiques vsed such bitter inuectiues, or writ or spake so irreuerently of the Ancient Fathers? With what forehead then can you, Sir Humfrey say, that wee, *conuicted by their euident testimonies, ether ridiculously elude them, or plainly reiect them?* But I am wel content to try out this with you by another way, and that is this.

5. To omit diuers particulars which you insist vpon in this Section, both because this Booke growes a great deale bigger then euer I entented
at the

at the first vndertaking, as also because the selfe same points, haue already bene hādled else where all excepting one or two, you bring *S. Austen* against the worship of Saints, and yet him selfe deuoutly praid vnto *S. Cyprian*. Tom. 7. contra *Donat*. lib. 7. cap. 1. & lib. 5. cap. 17. Moreouer in his booke of meditations cap. 24. him selfe maketh a long prayer to the Saints, saying. *O you that are void of care for your selues, by your charitie I beseech you, haue a care of vs. &c.* For his sake I beseech you, who hath chosen you, &c. be you alwayes mindfull of vs, and helpe vs miserable Wretches &c. *O you most faire gates, raised by God to that height of glorie &c.* I beseech you to pray continuallie and without ceasing, to make intercession for vs Wretched sinners, that by your prayers, wee may be admitted into your sacred societie &c. Pray therefore, o yee Holie Saints, pray to our Lord for vs, o all you troupes and assemblies of the blessed, pray for vs &c. And Meditation 40. he further saith thus. *O Marie Mother of God, Mother of Iesus Christ our Lord, thou sacred and vnspotted Virgin, vouchsafe to make intercession for me vnto him, who made thee a Worshy temple for him selfe to dwell in.* And in the same further saith. *O S. Michael, S. Gabriel, S. Raphael, o holie quires of Angels and Archangells, of Patriarches and Prophets, Of Apostles, and Euangelists, of Martyrs and Confessors, of Priests and Leuites, of Monkes and Virgins, and of all such as haue liued rightly, I presume to beseech you &c. that you would be pleased so pray for me a poore sinner &c.*

6. Lastly

6. Lastly, tom. 5. de ciuit. Dei, lib. 22. cap. 8. he recounteth a miracle which hapned to a poore old man of Hippo, called *Florentius*, who came to the shrine of the twentie Martyrs, and praied vnto them, and was miraculously holpen by their prayers. Now put these seauen or eight seuerall places, in to the ballance, against that one of your citing out of S. Austin; (*Many are tormented with the deuill, who are worshipped by men on earth.*) and see whether ouer-weigheth other? Yea, this saying of *Saint Augustin*, may bee well admitted for true, without any preiudice at all to the worship of Saints. For who knowes not that many false Gods of the Pagans, are tormented in hell, who yet are worshiped by them here in earth? But to passe to another.

7. You bring a place out of *S. Aug.* against the Supremacie of the Pope, and yet it is a world to see how many sayings of the same Saint, cōfirme the contrarie. For a first, take this, psal. con. part. Donat. Count the Priests frō the very sea of Peter, and on that order of Fathers, cōsider who to whom, hath succeeded: that same is the Rock, which the proud gates of hell do not overcome. Now, why should *S. Aug.* counsell, to count rather that sea of Peter, that order of Fathers, and affirme that to bee Rock which the proud gates of hell do not overcome rather then any other Sea, if he preferd not the Supremacie of that sea, before all others, and beleeued it should firmlie stand, when as all others should decay and fall?

8. For a *second*, take this de vilitate credendi cap. 17. *That is it which hath obtained the top of of authoritie, heretiques in vaine barking round about it. Mark here againe how hee setteth forth the honor of that Sea, saying. That is it which hath obtained (tell vs what, o great S. Aug.) the Top of authoritie. And what is the Top of authoritie, if not the Primacie?*

9. For a *third*, take this. The same S. Aug. Re-tract. lib. 1. cap. 21. cont. epist. Donati, with S. Ambrose speaking of S. Peter, saith thus. *The verie Rock of the Church did washe away his faults, when the Cock did crow. Which how could hee say, if he beleueed not the Primacie to be in Peter, and consequently, in the Pope his successor? And yet further in the same place, speaking of two prime Rocks, Christ and S. Peter, he saith thus. Harum duarum sententiarum qua sit probabilior, eligat Lector. Whether of these two opinions are the more probable, let the Reader choose. Which hee would neuer haue said, vnles he had thought that after Christ, S. Peter might bee said in verie good sence to be the Rock of the Church: which againe must needs implice the Supremacie.*

10. For a *fourth*, take this. S. Aug. homil. de pastor. Discourfing vpon those words of Christ spoken to S. Peter in the 20. of S. Iohn and willing him to feede his sheepe, saith thus. *There were many Apostles, and it is said to one, Feed my sheepe. And why this? Doubtles because the charge to feede the whole flock of Christ here in earth, was*
by

by Christ him selfe committed to *one* alone: and consequently proues the Supremacie in the Pope, the true successor of S. Peter in that pastorall charge.

11. For a *first* take this. S. Aug. in 165. as also in sundry other places, speaking of S. Peter, saith thus. *Petro, totius Ecclesie figuram gerenti, Dominus ait, super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam.* To Peter, bearing the figure of the *whole* Church, our Lord said, vpon this rock will I build my Church. Now to beare the figure of the *whole* Church, what else is it, but to haue Supremacie ouer the *whole* Church? If S. Peter had it, doubtles his successor must also needes haue it. But none is successor to S. Peter, vnlesse the Pope. Therefore the Supremacie is in the Pope.

12. For a *first*, take this. Doth not S. August. epist. 162. in the cause of Cecilian Bishop of Carthage (condemned being absent by 70. Bishops, and restored by pope Melciades Bishop of Rome, only by the voices of 18.) cry out in this maner of Pope Melciades saying? *O virum optimum, & filium Christianae pacis, & patrem Christianae plebis! &c. O excellent man! o sonne of Christian peace! and Father of the Christian people! compare now this paucitie, with that multitude of Bishops: nether yet compare number with number, but compare waight with waight. And then addeth. Quod Cecilianus &c. That Cecilian Bishop of Carthage, need not care for the multitude of enimies conspiring, seeing him selfe ioyned to the*
Roman

Roman Church, in qua semper Apostolica Cathedra viguit principatus. In which the principedome of the Apostolicall chaire allwayes Florished. Marke, I pray you, how much may be gathered out of these words of this incōparable Doctor, to proue the primacie of the Pope. Doth he not by way of wonder, entitle him, *The Father of the Christian people*, making all Christians but one people, and this one Father, the Father of them all? and what is this, but plainly to confesse the Popes Primacie? Doth he not compare 17. or 18. Bishops that stood with the Pope of Rome against 70. others, and doth he not prefer that smale number before that great, because of *the greater waight.* and how are 17. of greater waight then 70. if not by reason of the Primacie and powerfull sentence that was in the words of that one father of all Christian people, more then in 70. of a contrary opinion?

13. Lastly, to cleare all douts about this point, doth he not in very plaine and expresse tearmes acknowledg the Roman Church, that in her *allwayes flourished the Principedome or Soueraignitie of the Apostolicall chaire?* And what is the *Principedome*, but the primacie? And this not for a day, for a yeare, or whilst S. Peter liued and sate there, but *semper, allwayes, euermore* from Christ to vs?

14. Now Sir Humfrey, I haue giuen you here six seuerall sayings of S. Aug. to proue the *Supremacie* of the Pope; put them your selfe into the Ballance; weigh them with your owne hands, & tell

tell me truly if they do not euery way infinitely ouerweigh yours? Nor doth your place make ought at all against the primacie: for both Christ might build *S. Peter* vpon him selfe, not him selfe vpon *S. Peter* (as he did) and yet might also make him head of his Church after him selfe, and build his whole Church also vpon *S. Peter*, without any kind of contradiction. Now do you recõcile all my other places, out of *S. Aug.* so easilie as I haue done these two of yours. Many of your other obiections are composed of such slight stufte, that to repeate them, is to refute them: for example.

Sir Humfrey pag. 274.

Touching the Communion in both kindes, Ignatius saith. One cup is distributed to all. What saith Bellarmine to this authoritie? In the Latin bookes, it is not found that one Cup is giuen so all, but for all.

A N S W E R.

And what say you to the contrarie, to defend your opinion of giuing one Cup to all. True it is, and wee deny it not, one Cup was giuen to all the Apostles. But are all men and wemen Priests? The Cup was giuen to all Priests, ergo it must bee giuen to all Pedlers. What an ill shapen ergo call yee this? If you may argue after that maner, why not we after this. The Cup was giuen to none but priests. Ergo none but priests ought to receiue our Lords Cup?

Sir

Roman Church, in qua semper Apostolica Cathedra vixit principatus. In which the principedome of the Apostolicall chaire allwayes Florished. Marke, I pray you, how much may be gathered out of these words of this incōparable Doctor, to proue the primacie of the Pope. Doth he not by way of wonder, entitle him, *The Father of the Christian people*, making all Christians but one people, and this one Father, the Father of them all? and what is this, but plainly to confesse the Popes Primacie? Doth he not compare 17. or 18. Bishops that stood with the Pope of Rome against 70. others, and doth he not prefer that smale number before that great, because of *the greater waight.* and how are 17. of greater waight then 70. if not by reason of the Primacie and powerfull sentence that was in the words of that one father of all Christian people, more then in 70. of a contrary opinion?

13. Lastly, to cleare all douts about this point, doth he not in very plaine and expresse tearmes acknowledg the Roman Church, that in her *allwayes flourished the Principedome or Soueraignitie of the Apostolicall chaire?* And what is the *Principedome*, but the primacie? And this not for a day, for a yeare, or whilst S. Peter liued and sate there, but *semper, allwayes*, euermore from Christ to vs?

14. Now Sir Hamsfrey, I haue giuen you here six seuerall sayings of S. Aug. to proue the *Supremacie* of the Pope; put them your selfe into the Ballance; weigh them with your owne hands, & tell

tell me truly if they do not euery way infinitely ouerweigh yours? Nor doth your place make ought at all against the primacie: for both Christ might build S. Peter vpon him selfe, not him selfe vpon S. Peter (as he did) and yet might also make him head of his Church after him selfe, and build his whole Church also vpon S. Peter, without any kind of contradiction. Now do you recōcile all my other places, out of S. Aug. so easilie as I haue done these two of yours. Many of your other obiections are composed of such slight stufte, that to repeate them, is to refute them: for example.

Sir Humfrey pag. 274.

Touching the Communion in both kindes, Ignatius saith. One cup is distributed to all. What saith Bellarmine to this authoritie? In the Latin bookes, it is not found that one Cup is giuen to all, but for all.

A N S W E R.

And what say you to the contrarie, to defend your opinion of giuing one Cup to all. True it is, and wee deny it not, one Cup was giuen to all the Apostles. But are all men and women Priests? The Cup was giuen to all Priests, ergo it must bee giuen to all Pedlers. What an ill shapen ergo call yee this? If you may argue after that maner, why not we after this. The Cup was giuen to none but priests. Ergo none but priests ought to receiue our Lords Cup?

Sir

Sir Humfrey pag. *ibid.*

Touching the Sacrament of Christs body, Origen saith. Thus much be spoken of the typicall and symbolicall body. What saith Senensis to this authoritie? To speake my minde freely, I suspect this place to be corrupted by heretiques?

A N S W E R.

And what say you, Sir Humfrey; say you, or dare you say, that neuer ancient Father was corrupted by heretiques? O But you will say, that Origen teatmes it a Typicall and Symbolicall body: Ergo not the true and very body of Iesus Christ. I haue heretofore put you and M. Preston ouer to sundry learned Protestants to dispute this point, I will here in this place put you ouer to one more, and he a profest opponent of the same man, who at this present opposeth you, to wit, Master Alexander Cooke, who thus dresseth this dish to both our hands, in his *Abatement of Popish bragg* pag. 12.

Wee beleene as well as you, that Christs flesh and blood are truly present, and truly receiued of the faithfull at the Lords Table. Wee teache the people, that, Christi corpus datur, accipitur, manducatur in Cæna: the bodie of Christ is giuen (indeed and Verely) and taken, and eaten in the Lords supper. The question betweene vs and you, is, de Modo, about the maner of Christs presence, and not de Obiecto, whether it be present yea or no.

And

And pag. 13. speaking of these words of Christ; *This is my body*, he further saith. We do not expound them so. We say, that the wordes are meant of Christ him selfe: the word that was made flesh (Iohn 1. 14.) We expound them not of the signe of his flesh. We teach, that the true bread: the bread of God which came downe from heauen, and giueth life vnto the world, is Christ, euen the flesh, the very flesh of Christ, that is, Christ incarnat &c. Lo, how this man abates our Popish braggs, or rather tramples vnder foote your single Sole, Topically, and Symbolicall Supper. This, I wot, is no good agreement in so substantiall & fundamental point of your faith. But to proceed.

Sir Humfrey pag. 274.¹

Touching Transubstantiation, Theodoret saith, the substance of bread and wine, ceaseth not in the Sacrament. What answer the Romanists to this Authority? Gregorie de Valencia saith, Theodoret was noted to haue erred in the Councell of Ephesus, although he afterwards repented him selfe.

A N S W E R.

1. And what say you, Sir Humfrey, was it impossible for one man to erre, and afterwards to repent himselfe? How then, according to your 21. English Article, may your whole Reformed Church be beleeued to haue erred, and yet still to remayne a true Church, though neuer repenting her selfe of so grosse an error?

Q 9

2. That

2. That of *Epiphanius* about *Images*, may be answered by that brought before out of *Origen*. That of *S. Cyprian* about *Traditions*, by that I haue answered to the obiection of *Theodoret*. That out of *S. Chrysostome* touching priuat Masse, that of *Prudentius*, that out of *Tertullian* and *Origen*, both Heretiques, that of *S. Ierom*, and out of *Iustin*, may all be answered with that your selfe hath brought out of *Canus*. *Ierom is no Rule of faith*. What say you *Sir Humfrey* to the contrarie? All the rest that followes to the end of this Section, is such triuiall stuffe, as it is not worth the repeating, vnlesse to retort it vpon your selfe. Which, with litle labor, is thus performed.

Sir Humfrey pag. 277.

Thus the Fathers are no Fathers (saith learned Whiskakers) if they teach contrarie to the holy Father the Pope (who forsooth him selfe a litle before censured the Popish Religion, to be a patched couerlet of the Fathers errors, sowed together.) If they write that which pleaseth him, they are allowed for Fathers; If they differ from him, they are not allowed the name of Fathers (as true as gospell in the Protestants, who set not by a thousand Austins, and a thousand Cyprians, if they stand against them.) You haue heard the prooffe of the Romish Witnesse, in the chiefe points made good by the testimonies of the Fathers themselves (all proued to be friuolous:) You haue heard likewise, notwithstanding their great vaunt of the Fathers, how lightly they regard them or reiect them,

them, When they speake not Placentia, agreeable to their Church and doctrine. And that no man may doubt, that many in the bosome of their owne Church, haue spoken freely and truly in many particular points of our doctrine, both with vs, and against their owne Tenets, behould it is so truly and sensibly felt, and commonly vnderstood, euen among them selues, that some chiefe protectors of their cause, haue complained to the Inquisitors, and the Inquisitors of their zeale, in defence of the Roman faith (say but English, and all the rest will quadrat for vs) haue sent out, *Ad melius inquirendum*, a new writ of Inquiry after such delinquents, and haue censured them with a *Deleatur*, in those pages, that make ether for our doctrine, or against their owne. As appears by their Indices Expurgatory, and of bookes prohibited, by the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and confirmed by the authority of Pope Pius 4. Sixtus 5. and Clement 8.

A N S W E R.

1. As though many Protestants, haue not spoken truly and freely in many points of our Doctrine, both for vs, and against their owne Tenets? Wherein I report me for prooffe, to that laborious and learned worke of the Protestant Apologie. As though Protestants neuer sent out a writ of Inquiry, *ad melius inquirendum*, after such delinquents, and censured them with a *Deleatur*? As though Protestants suffered all men freely to write, to speake, to print what they please, without any let

or opposition? Why then doe they vse such strict searches, and such seuerer *inquirendums*, to suppress the diuulging of our Catholique Bookes? As though Protestants had no *Indices Expurgatory* of bookes prohibited, by the decrees of their English Church? What say you then to this that doth ensue, lately suppress'd by publique proclamation?

BY THE KING.

*A proclamation, for the suppressing of a booke intituled, Appello Casarem, or, An Ap-
peale to Caesar.*

WHeras we, out of our care to conserue & maintaine the Church, committed to our Charge, in the vnitie of true Religion, and the bond of peace, and not to suffer vnneccessary disputes, which may trouble the quiet both of Church and State, haue lately caused the *Articles of Religion* to be reprinted, as a Rule for the auoiding of the diuersities of opinion, and for the establishing of consent in true Religion. We, continuing our desire to compasse this wished effect, & considering that the Booke written by *Richard Montagu*, now Bishop of *Chichester*, then but Batchelor of Diuinitie,

uinitie, intituled, *Appello Cæsarem*, or an Ap-
peale to Cæsar, and published in the yeare
1625. was the first cause of those disputes and
differences, which haue sithence much trou-
bled the quiet of the Church; haue thought
it fitting to take away the occasion, by cal-
ling in the said Booke. And therefore we do
hereby wil, and straightly command all and
singular persons whatsoeuer, who haue, or
shall haue any of them in their hands or cu-
stodie, that vpon paine of our high displea-
sure, and the consequence thereof, they doe
deliuer the same presently vpon this publica-
tion, to the Lord Bishop of the Diocesse, or
his Chancellor, if he be out of the vniuersi-
ties; or if it be in ether of the two vniuersi-
ties, to the Chancellor, or vice-Chancellor
there, whom we straightly command to sup-
presse the same: hoping therby, that men wil
no more trouble thē selues with these vnne-
cessarie questiōs, the first occasion being takē
away. But if we shall be deceiued in this our
expectation, and that by reading, preaching,
or making Bookes, ether *pro*, or *contra*, con-
cerning these differences, men begin a new
to dispute, we shall take such order with thē,
and those Bookes, that they shall wishe they

had neuer thought vpon these needlesse Controuerfies.

Giuen at our Court at White-Hall the 17. day of Ianuary, in the 4. yeare of our Reigne, of Great Britanie, France, and Ireland.

God saue the King.

2. Are you not ashamed now, *Sir Humfrey*, of what you haue said? You thinke it a great disgrace, a great asperſion for vs, that we should haue any *Indices Expurgatorie* of prohibited books, how then would you haue vnitie conserued in the Catholique Church. Trulie, I am sorie to see, and wearie to reade such weake stuffe, which as you see, is with such facilitie solued by vs, and so easilie retorted vpon your selues. Your Catalogue, *Sir Humfrey* come out with your Catalogue: especially sith your selfe so freely confesse, that it is an *undoubted truth*, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages. Epist. Ded. pag. 3. Especially sith *S. Paul* so plainly assureth vs; And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors &c. to continue; vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith. Ephes. 4. 11. Sith also the Prophet Iemie so plainly assureth vs; Behould the dayes will come, saith our Lord, and I will sow the house of *Israell*, and the house of *Iuda*, with the seede of men. And a litle after, Thus saith our Lord, that giueth the Sunne for the light of the day, the order of the Moone and of
the

the Starres for the light of the night &c. If these lawes shall sayle before me, saith our Lord, then also the seede of Israel shall sayle, that it be not a nation before me for euer,

3. Now, Sir Humfrey, this *seede of men*, sown in the Reformed Church by the hand of our Lord him selfe, that absolute seedes-man; This *pure seede*, sown without the mixture of any Cocle; This *seede*, the rootes whereof can be no more pluckt vp, then can the Sunne, the Moone, and the Starres, planted by God, be plucked vp by the rootes. This *seede*, which hath according to Gods lawe, no more *sayled* to grow for euer in the Church, then the Sunne, Moone, and Starres haue ceased hitherto to shine in heauen; This *seede*, I say *Distinct* from ours; *Pure*, without our Cockles; *Orderly*, but not from our Pastors; *Successiue*, in the same line; *Perpetuall*, without any such patrie stuffe as a Pope *Ioane*; *vniformely*, with the same *Consent*, so as the first and last were all one: the first a Protestant, the last a Protestant, where may a good fellow finde one only graine? You see how we presse you, you see how we put you to it abundantly out of the very word of God; & when will shew vs one of these so much desired *seedes*? one of these most pretious graines, together with that Reformed Contry or field were in it growes? Surelie, would you once shew vs such a field, many thousands of vs, would goe and sell all we haue to buy that field; If no one alone had wealth enough, we would with the good *Machabees*,

make a gathering amongst vs, of many thousand Drachmes of siluer, and send it to the owner thereof to procure that purchase.

Section XIII.

O *Vr Aduersaries conuincd of a bad cause, and an euill conscience, by razing of our Records, and clipping their owne Authors tongues.*

ANSWER.

1. Here we haue a new *Section*, wherein was expected some new matter, and here is nothing but what we had already in the former: nothing but the same Cuckoos song you sung vs before. There, we, conuicted by the testimonies of the Fathers, plainly reiected them; Here, conuincd by them, we raze them. There our Inquisitors sent out a new writ of Inquirie, to haue the books that made against vs, censured with a *Deleatur*: here the like is done some dosen times, with the like *Deleatur*. There our *Indices Expurgatorie*, prohibited many Bookes which made for Protestants: and here againe they do the like. What trifling is this? What wasting of winde? What pitifull spending of inke and paper, all to no purpose? It seemes to me, you care not what you say, so you say somewhat that hath a shew to fill vp a booke, employ a printer, exercise a Reader, and

tur-

turmoile him that should be the Answerer. Our stomaches are cloyed, and our soules begin to loath this light meate. Presse vs Sir, *Humsfrey*, some better and more solid stufte, or put vp your pipes.

2. You tell vs of *razing your Records*, and *clipping our owne Authors tongues*. Now, what Records of yours in all this Section do you charge vs to haue *razed*? All you name, are only these. 1. The latin Bible printed by *Robert Steuens*. 2. The glosse vpon *Gratian*. 3. *Cassander* an heretick and lawier as some say. 4. *Cardinall Caietan*. 5. *Ydalicus* Bishop of Augusta. 6. *Bertram* a Benedictin monke, and obscure Author. 7. *Saint Anselme* a Papist Archbishop. 8. The same *Cassander* that before. 9. *Langus* a layman and a Lutheran. 10. *Forus*. 11. The ancient Councell of *Laodicea*. 12. And the Deane of Louaine. You can not call any of theould writers, or their writings, *your Records*: and sure I am, you will not iustifie any one of them in all points, without *clipping their tongues*, yea, their toes and fingers too; If you dare deny this, name vs but *one only Author* of yours, and he, of *eminent fame* and *renowne*; *approved* by the whole Church; *in any one Age*, for a thousand yeares before Luther; *in any nation* vnder heauen; and for that *one Authors* sake, we will free you of that *Catalogue*, which to your eternall shame, we haue so often called for, and cannot obtaine. I Challenge you, I dare you, and redare you do to this. If you dare not do this, what a tale, what a toy is it, to
tell

tell vs of *razing your Records, and clipping our owne Authors tongues?*

3. Touching what you say of our *owne Authors*, we confesse it, we deny it not to be the practise of the Catholique Church, that if she finde in her childrens writings, any thinge *contrarie* ether to holy *Scripture*, or vniforme *consent* of Ancient *Fathers*, she nether alloweth it, nor auoweth it; she nether winketh at it, nor dissembleth it, but by her *Expurgatorie Indices*, commādeth it to be spunged and blotted out, or to vie your owne phrase, dasheth it with a *Deleatur*. Cōtrarywise, Protestāts seldome vsing such *Expurgatorie Indices* to sponge out errors in their Authors, nor no such care to conferue *vnitie* and *Conformitie* in their faith and doctrine, euery man writes what he listes, houlds what he listes, belieues what he listes: and consequently, ether their Church must needs be said plainlye to dissemble her childrens errors, or to make them her owne, and to bind her selfe to abett them: and which, to say the very truth, is that which giueth vs so great aduantage, in all our present disputes against them; and contrariewise, secureth the Catholique cause against all their calumnies.

4. As for the edition of *Robert Steuens*, *Cassander*, *Langus*, *Ferus*, the Deane of Louaine, and their like, what authoritie, or what antiquitie ascribe you to their *Records*, being all men that liued since *Luther* dyed? And so satisfie nothing at all our demand. *Where was your Church before Luther?*

Luther? Away, Sir Humfrey, away with such toying, such dallying, such trifling out the time in vaine. A way with such emptie brags, away with such beggarly rags. There is nothing in all this Section that is worth a Rush; nothing said but what was both said, and answered in the former, wherto therefore I remit you; both because the same fact is retorted vpon your selfe, which you would seeme to impose vpon others as a fault, as also because it is quite and cleane from the state of the question, and answer to the *Iesuits Challenge*. Nothing at all in acquitting your self in the mayne point of your vndertaking. Nothing at al for clearing that *indouted truth* and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages (Epist. Ded. pag. 3.) Your Catalogue Sir Humfrey, come out with your Catalogue, with sacred Scripture so plainly assureth vs. *And he gaue some Apostles, and and some Prophets, and other some Euangelists, end other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the Ministry, vnto the edifying of the body of Christ, untill we meete all into the unitie of faith, and knowledge of the Sonne of God into a perfect man: into the measure of the age of the fulnesse of Christ, that now we be not children wauering, and caried about with euery winde of doctrine, in the wickednes of men, in craftines to the circumuention of error.* Ephes. 4. 11. &c.

5. Loc, Sir Humfrey, how still I beate you
downe

downe with the word of God? How still I presse you? how still I put you to it? how still I hould you to our Text, the true Touchstone of all truth: the sole Rule of your Religion. We aske for Protestant *Apostles*, for Protestant *Prophetes*, for Protestant *Euangelists*, for Protestant *Pastors*, for Protestant *Doctors*, for Protestants *Saints*, for Protestant *Builders*, of the body Christ; for Protestants, *met all in the vnitie of the Protestant faith*, for Protestants *met in the knowledge of the Sonne of God into a perfect Protestant man*, for Protestants *met in the measure of the age of the fulnes of Christ*, which, as your selfe truly expound, is the faith that Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, and had visible Professors in all Ages: This *Sir Humfrey*; is indeed, *the fulnesse of the Age of Christ*. When will you meete vs here? When will you meete vs vpon our owne ground? when will you beate vs with our owne weapons, as you long since boasted you would do? when will you returne vs this full Answer? Till you do this, we tell you plainly, you do but trifle with vs; we tell you plainly you do but seeke to make *children of vs*; but seeke to make vs *waue*; but seeke to carrie vs *about* with the *Wind* of your doctrine which (as the Apostle right well noteth,) vnlesse deduced from the *fulnes of the Age of Christ*, by by Pastors and Doctors, is indeed an emptie *Winde*, *Wickednes*, *craftines*, and *circumvention of error*. I say *into the fulnes of the Age of Christ* (now *sixteene hundred yeares old*) and in a *perfect*, not

an imperfect man, such as that mixt, and imaginarie body must needs bee compounded partly of Protestants, partly of Papists, or Protestants imbreasted in Papists bosomes. O Sir Hamfrey, when will you performe this! When (taking the thing at the hart, as indeed you ought) will you say with the Prophet David (psal. 131.) I haue sworne to our Lord, I haue vowed a vow to the God of Iacob, If I shall enter into the tabernacle of my house, if I shall ascend into the bed of my couch, if I shall give sleepe to myne eyes, and slumbering to myne eye-lids, and rest to my temples, till I haue found out, where our Church was before Luther, then neuer let me oppose Papist more? Which till you performe, Luthers profession shall be my conclusion; The arguments and reasonings of the Sacramentaries, are such vaine words, without wit, that I cannot maruell sufficiently, how learned men can bee moued with such lyes. And truly, they do their matters with so fearfull a cōscience, that they seeme to wishe they had neuer taken them in hand: verely I suppose, if they were to consult of the matter afresh, they would neuer begin. Thus Luther tome 7. *Defensio verborum cana.*

Section XIV.

Our aduersaries convicted of their defence of a desperat cause, by their blasphemous exceptions against the Scripture it selfe.

Sir

Sir Humfrey pag. 286.

When therfore we see with the Louaine Doctor, *poysen in their Religion, and tyrannie in their common welth.* When we apparantly discern, *the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, let vs fly* (saith Chrysostome) *to the mountaines of the scriptures.* But can any man be perswaded, that these men, after their purging and condemning all sorts of writers, will at last come to the triall of the Scriptures? Are we not all eye-witnesses, that Christ and his Apostles, are called in question at the Popes Assises, and there arraigned and condemned of obscuritie and insufficiencie in their Gospell? Hath it not the first place, in the Catalogue of bookes prohibited; (88. vntruth.) vpon pretence of some corruption in the Translation?

A N S W E R.

1. Lo what big and blustering words! Wee are conuicted of *blasphemie* at least, for taking exceptions against the Scriptures. There is *poysen* in our Religion: *tyrannie* in our common wealth: and the *abomination of desolation* standing in our holy place. And yet in this abomination of desolation, haue Protestants stood this 1500. yeares together, or else haue had no standing at all to sell a pipe or whistle of a penny: they haue liued vnpoysoned, in our poysen: haue bene imbreasted, euen in the very bosome of our tyranicall commonwealth, and yet neuer tasted of our tyrannie.

Who

Who euer read, who euer heard of such a Chymera ! Moreouer Christ and his Apostles, are called in question at the *Popes Asises*. They are there arraigned and condemned of obscuritie and insufficiencie in their gospel. The sacred Bibell is ranked by them, *inter libros prohibitos*. Their workes and writings, haue the first place in the Catalogue of prohibited bookes, vpon pretence of some corruption in the translation. All this Protestants see, with the eyes of *Henric Boxhorne*, the Louaine Doctor. All this they apparantly discern. Of all this they are al eye-witnesses. *Casaubon* the French Hugenor, will beare witness with them, if you will not beleue them in that which they all see with their owne eyes. What stubborne stocks, what senslesse blocks are all Papiests, who will not beleue Protestants vpon such cleare and euident proofes ?

Sir Humfrey pag. 288.

Now can any man imagine, why these men should be so angrie with Christ and his Apostles ? Can they say the word of God is mutable and vncertaine ? Or can they say, it is subiect vnto alteration, and needes an *Index expurgatorius*.

A N S W E R.

1. Can any man Imagine, that so wise a man as *Sir Humfrey* would bee supposed to bee, would euer make such a childishe demand ? Yet as childish as it is, it being made, wee must returne an

Answer

Answer to it: and this it is. King *Henrie the VIII.* together with the whole court of Parliament, condemned by Statute Tindals Translation, as *crasie, false, and vnttrue*, defending it to be vsed or kept within his dominious, as is yet to bee seene in the Statute it selfe Anno 34. 38. Hen. 8. cap. 1. In which Bishop *Tunstall* noted no lesse then 2000. corruptions, only in the new Testament, not at all touching theould. *M. Burges* accuseth the English approued Protestant translation of *many omissions, many additions, sometimes perueruing the sence, sometimes making is senceles, sometimes contrarie.* That great & learned linguist *M. Broughton*, speaking of the English translation of the Bible, saith thus. *It peruerteth the text of theould Testament in 848. places, & causeth million of millions to reiect the new, and so runne to eternall flames.* Aduertis. to the Prot. Bishops. I omit, what your owne learned *M. Reynolds*, and our late learned Soueraigne King *James* him selfe hath said, affirming, that at his coming to the crowne of England, there was not one true translation to be found. *Barlo.* in his Relat. confer. at hamp. pag. 45.

2. Now to repay you *Sir Humfrey*, in your owne species; I will Imagin *Tindall* telling you this mercie tale, which you tell vs. *Are we not all eye-witneses, that Christ and his Apostles are called in question at King Harries Assises, and there condemned of obscuritie and insufficiencie in their Gospel? bath is not the first place in the Catalogue of bookes prohibited, vponpretence of some corruption in the Translation?*

tion? &c. Can any man Imagine, Why these men (M. Bruges, M. Broughton, our late learned Soueraigne and M. Reinolds) should bee so angrie with Christ and his Apostles? Can they say, the Word of God is mutable and vncertaine? Or can they say, It is subiect vnto alteration, and needs an Index Expurgatorius? And after all these Cans of Sir Humfreys, let me I pray come in also with my Can; Can then the Reader abstaine from laughter, to heare Sir Humfrey tell such a triuall tale? Can he hold it in, Can he hide it, vnlesse he hold his handfull hard vpon his mouth, and presse his teeth together with all his might lest the muttering break forth, and so disquiet the waight and grauitie of this discourse? Lord haue mercie vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs, to see with what fillie shifts, learned Protestants seeke to deceiue their simple and incautelous Readers! To see for what course, counterfer, and ill wouen ware, vnlearned Protestants lay to pawne their very soules! Who euer saw such pedling, poore and emptie Proofoes? Who euer read of such sandy Reasons? how could I here vndoe you, if I would dilate my selfe? But my Booke ere I was a ware, is sweld so big, that it cries out of me to come to an end: my purse also begins to complaine of my pen, and therefore Sir I pray proceed.

Sir Humfrey pag. 290.

Behould what reuerence they yeld vnto the Scripture? What seemes blasphemie if this doth not? Is it then any wonder, that Robert Tuitien-

sis, cryed out before the Pope, *Eye vpon Peter, Eye vpon Paul*; When these men dare deliuer such accursed speeches, against the whole body of the Scripture, which they durst not pronounce vpon a Popes Bull, or a Kings proclamation? Certainly, the Archangel, contending with the Diuell, durst not bring against him, such rayling accusations, as these men contending with vs, haue brought against the truth of God, and his heauély word. *&c. And then pag. 293.* If these men would maintaine no other Tenet, but this alone. *The Scripture is vnperfect*: they shall neuer bee able to proue their doctrine Apostolique, nor their Church Catholique. But to waue the Scriptures and Fathers, and writers, as vnperfect, and yet to cry out with the Father of Lyes; *All is myne*; this is a proper piece of policie, to delude the ignorant, and deceiue their owne soules. For the truth is, howsoeuer they pretend, that the sound of their Roman faith, goeth thorough the whole world (albeit the emptiest vessels, make the greatest sound) their silencing of Scriptures in forbidding the reading of them by the people, and their purging of learned writers (as Sir Humfrey hath dealt by Bertram, and other Protestants by M. Montagu) argue a distrust in their owne cause, least the truth should appeare.

A N S W E R.

1. Behould as idle a tale as euer man could,
 Linde almost with as many vntruths, as there are
 Lines.

Lines. Wee yeld (forsooth) no reuerence to the Scriptures, we blaspheme and the like, because we wil not reuerence and allow your hereticall translations, quite contrary to any euer extant from Christ and his Apostles times, vnto this present, Censured and condemned for such, euen by our late learned Soueraigne him selfe, and by other the best learned of your owne side. Is it not a great wonder, that his Maiestie at his coming to the crowne of England, durst to deliuer such accursed speeches, against the whole bodie of your English Bible, as to say, that there was not one true Translation to bee found amongst them all, which hee neuer pronounced vpon any Popes Bull, or Kings Proclamation? Tell him then, as you do vs, that certainly the Archangell contending with the Diuel, durst not bring against him such rayling accusations, as hee contending with you, hath brought against the truth of God, and his heauenly word. Tell him, as you do vs, if he would mainraine no other Tenet then this alone, he shall neuer be able to proue his doctrine Apostolique, nor his Church Catholique. Tell him, as you do vs, that to waue the Scriptures, Fathers, and writers, as vnperfect, and yet to cry out with the Father of Lyes, *All is myne*, this is a proper peece of policie, to delude the ignorant, and deceiue his owne and others soules: or else I must needs tell you, the truth is, howsoeuer you pretend, that the sound of your Reformed faith, is gone thorough the whole world, albeit

the emptiest vessells, make the greatest sound, yet you craftily silencing these heauie crymes, laid to your English Churches charge, vie a proper peece of policie, to cry out with the Father of Lyes, *All is myne*, so to delude ignorant and de-
ceiued soules.

2. Happie are you, *Sir Humfrey*, that euer your booke fell into the hands of such a foole, had a schollar but encountered you, how would hee haue coursed you otherwise then I haue done? Yea the very Authorities them selues brought by vs against you, ought to bee held of far greater force, then that which you haue brought against vs out of *Causaban*, a profest enimie of the Papists: contrarie wherto, those produced by me against you, are by your owne selues, reputed for prime and learned Protestants. How miserable then, yea how desolare, or rather desperat is your cause, who nether satisfie your vndertaken taske, by producing a *Catalogue* of Protestant professors in all Ages, especially in those before *Luther*, nor bring ought against vs in other discourse, which is not with great facilitie, retorted by vs vpon your selfe? Rightly therefore may I returne vpon you the same wordes which you haue taken out of *F. Campian*. Can I imagine any of you to be so stuffed in the Nose, that being forewarned, cannot quickly smell out this subtilling? Pag. 292. As also those out of *S. Chrysost.* or the Author of the Imperfect worck. For they know, that if the truth bee once laid open, their Church shall bee forsaken; and they,
from

point, how make you good, or how inforce you him to confesse, *the vncertainie and Noueltie of his owne*? Doth *Bellarmino* teach, that a man may be iustified by faith in his Religion, without any earnest repentance for his deadly sinne?

9. Thus being come to the end of all your severall Instances in this Section (which are 7. in number:) to wit; Touching our seaven Sacraments, Transubstantiation, Priuat Masse, Prayer in a knowen Tongue, Communion in both kinds, your two Sacraments, and faith and good works, not so much as any one of all your Instances, answered precisely to your vndertaking, you have inforced *Cardinall Bellarmine*, to testifie the truth of your doctrine, iust as we have inforced you to shew vnto vs; *Where Was your Church before Luther*? Which you nether euer hitherto have done, nor neuer will be able to do, though we should call vpon you betwixt this and domes day. And yet (o strang!) your selfe ingeniously confesse, *It is an vndoubted truth and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible professors in all Ages. And yet the sacred Scripture assureth vs. And he gave some (Protestant) Apostles, and some (Protestant) Prophets, and othersome (Protestant) Euangelists, and othersome (Protestant) Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the (Protestant) Saints, vnto the worke of the (Protestant) Ministrie, vnto the edifying of the (Protestant) body of Christ, vntill we meete all into the vnitie of the Protestant faith, and knowledge*

ledge of the Sonne of God into a perfect (Protestant) man, if all bee true which you suggest vnto the simple.

10. How vainly, how deceitfully, how impertinently then come you in, with our Papist Pastors, and with our Papist Doctors, which you condemne for false Pastors and false Doctors? Or how could false Pastors and false Doctors, preach and deliuer to the people, in all Ages, the same faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, and yet they them selues still remayne true Pastors and true teachers? For if they taught some thing true, and some thing false in many of the after and ensuing Ages, then ether was it not the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, or Christ and his Apostles taught some thing true and some thing false, which were blasphemie to imagine. And therefore *Luthers* profession, shall be my conclusion; *The Arguments and reasonings of the Sacramentaries, are such vaine words, without wit, that I cannot maruell sufficiently, how learned men can bee moued with such lyes. And truly, they do their matters with so fearfull a conscience, that they seeme to wishe they had neuer taken them in hand: verely I suppose, if they were to consult of the matter a fresh, they would neuer begin.* Thus *Luther* tom. 7. *Defensio verborum cœna. fol. 138.*

Section XVI.

Our Aduersaries obiection drawn from the testimonies of pretended Martyrs of their Religion, answered.

ANSWER.

You deny the three and thirtie Bishops and Popes of Rome, to haue dyed martyrs of our Religion; Or to haue liued or dyed members of our present Church. Let vs examine (say you) some particulars.

Sir Humfrey pag. 306.

Did euer any Martyr die vpon confidence of his owne merits? Or dare any Romanist suffer death in iustification of his owne righteousness? Was there any one of those three and thirtie Bishops canonized a Saint for his Adoration giuen to Images? Did euer any Martyr take it vpon his death, or dare any Romish priest die vpon his confidence, that he hath absolute power to remit sinnes, to dispense with oathes, to creat in the Sacrament the Creator of heauen and earth? Did euer any ancient Martyr teach, that the scripture was imperfect, without the helpe of Traditions? Or dare any Romanist to take it vpon his death, that all the vnwritten verities, now taught and received in the Church of Rome, are of equall authority

ritie with the Scripture? (*Which of vs euer taught this?*)

A N S W E R.

1. You set vp a Shawfoole, *Sir Humfrey*, and shoote at it your selfe alone. This is still the poorest stuffe that may be imagined. This still bewrayes the pouertie and beggarie of your cause. It is a signe you are put into great straites, when you are faine to vnhamper and winde your selfe out, by such miserable and sorrie shifts, instead of answering directly to our demand; *Where was your Church before Luther*; But admit these three and thirtie holy Martyrs, were not of our Romish Religion? Doth it therfore follow that they were of yours? Or are there no more Religions in the world, then *Ours* and *Yours*? Admit they dyed not for any of these Articles related by you, might they not die for other Articles, and yet be martyrs of our Church? Or are there no more Articles of faith in all our Church, then these five or six here set downe? Who euer met with so shallow a man? Who euer endeououred to deceiue, if *Sir Humfrey* do not?

2. But to discouer yet further the great weakness of this discourse, I make vnto you this demand. Did euer any of these Martyrs die in confident denyall, that good works do merit nothing? Or dare any Protestant suffer death, that iustifying faith once had, makes him so iust, that his iustice cannot afterwards be lost? Was there any of those three and thirtie Bishops canonized a Saint, for his

his breaking or burning the Images, ether of
Christ him selfe, or any his B. Saints? Did euer
any Martyr take it vpon his death, or dare any En-
glish Minister die, in denyall that man hath no
power to remit sinnes, when the contrary is so
expresse in your owne Communion booke? Did
euer any of those three & thirtie blessed Bishops,
die in defence of the secular Princes Supremacy?
Or did any one of them giue his life in defence
that a woman, or a childe, may be head of the
Church in all causes, as wel Ecclesiastical, as Tem-
porall? Did euer any of those anciēt Martyrs teach,
that the written word was so sufficient of it selfe
to decide all controuersies in matters of faith, as
that the helpe of the Churches Tradition was vt-
terly needlesse? Or dare any Minister take it vpon
his death, that all the vnwritten verities, now
taught and receiued in the Church of England (as
Godfathers and Godmothers in Christning of
children, the signe of the Crosse, giuing and recei-
uing a weding ringe at the time of mariage, tol-
ling of a bell for the sicke when they lie a dying,
and the like) are of equall authority with the scrip-
ture? Briefly did any of these three and thirty Mar-
tyrs take it vpon his death, that there were but
two Sacraments? That in the Communion there
was nothing but bare bread? That there was no
Purgatorie? That Saints were not to be praid to?
That diuine seruice might not be said in the la-
tin tongue to the vulgar people? Durst any of
them haue dyed vpon it, that man had not free

will,

will,

will, & that he could not possibly keepe the Commandements of God, although seconded and assisted with the helpe of his heavenly grace? *Lord haue mercie vpon vs, Christ haue mercie vpon vs, Lord haue mercie vpon vs*, to see with what fillie eyes, vnlearned Protestants reade such fillie Books; and to see with what fillie shifts, learned Protestants seeke to deceiue their simple Readers! But to the rest of this tale of your *via Tuta*.

3. Touching what you alleage about F. Garnetts answer (pag. 308.) *Whether if he were to consecrate the Sacrament that morning he should suffer death, he durst after consecration, pronounce openly ouer the Cup*, the words which there you suggelt, together with his supposed perplexitie; for answer therto, I say he replyed very discreetly, not for that there is any dout in the Churches doctrine concerning the verity of the blood of Christ in the B. Sacrament after the words of consecration, pronounced by a lawfull priest, but in respect of other douts, which might administer matter to him to conceiue that dout; for example, whether he were a Priest or no? For if no Priest, then could he not consecrate. Nor could he know he were a Priest, vnlesse he knew he were a Christian. Nor no man knowes, or can know himself of his owne knowledge, to be Baptised and a Christian, vnlesse by the report and relation of other men. And it were rashnes for a man, to deprive him selfe of his part in the blood of Christ, vpon supposed acts, and probable presumptiōs, grounded vpon the know-
ledge

they teach, not the doctrine of God, but the doctrine of Devils.

2. Touching the text alleadged, your false glosse (whereof I lately gaue you an Item) had loone bene discouered; had you laid it downe at lenght as the Apostle doth, who instantly after the words you curtall, addeth this: *For every creature of God is good*: plainly declaring, that abstinence only to be disallowed, which condemneth the creatures of God to be naught by nature & creation? There being that maintained, some to haue beene made by an euill God; Can you accuse vs to do this? If not, then as you see, I truly coulde you that your searching, reading, and meditating scriptures, is but to do mischief, by misapplying them against the truth of God and his Church, and against the sence and meaning of the holie Ghost.

3. Touching the second (forbidding of Mariage) true it is, the Apostle saith it is *the doctrine of Devils*. But doth he say, that to forbid the Mariage of Priests (for of them you speake) is *the doctrine of Devils*? Where finde you this, or how proue you this out of this, or any Apostle that euer wrote? If this place make not any thing for mariage of Priests, then is it meerely to no purpose, for deny we mariage to any but to vowed persons? If we did, no Catholique at all could marrie. How impertinent then, is your allegation, and application of these two places of holy Scripture?

Sir Humfrey pag. 315.

Are they blessed, that administer the Sacrament and seruice, in an vnknownen tongue? *In shew it is written, With men of other tongues and other lippes, will I speake vnto this people, & so they shall not heare me, saith the Prophet Esay. 23. 11.*

A N S W E R.

1. Are they blessed, or accursed, which peruert the sence of Gods holy word, to aduance their owne hereticall fancies? Then are you, *Sir Hum*: accursed, not blessed, for peruerting the sence of this sacred text. The Prophet *Isay* in this place, exclaime against sinners, for their excessive pride and drunkenness: and you applie, and vige this place, against administering the Sacrament, and Seruice in an vnknownen tongue; Were you sober when you did this? You seeme in sundry places (at least in words) to extolle the ancient Fathers and their orthodox interpretations, vnto heauen; Shew me out of all your reading, or out of all the ancient Fathers that euer wrote, in 1500. yeares from Christ to *Luther*, that euer any one, ether Greeke or Latin, vnderstood or expounded this place, in the same sence that you do here? I challenge you, I vige you, *Sir Hum*: to returne an answer to this demand in particular.

2. But not to let you escape so good cheape, I charge you with a far more haynous crime. I charge you, not only to haue peruerted the sence of these sacred wordes, but flatly to haue corrupted the text it selfe. For what Bible, of any language

guage, reades vnto vs as you reade here? Your late Reformed English Bible of anno 1615. readeth thus. For *with stammering lippes, and another tongue, will he speake to this people.* & vers. 12. To Whom he said, *This is the rest, wherewith, you may cause the weary to rest, and this is the refreshing, yet they would not heare.* Our English Douay translation, readeth thus. For in the speech of lippe, and in another tongue, he will speake to his people. vers. 11. 12. To Whom he said; *This is my rest, refresh the weary, and this is my refreshing: and they would not heare.* The latin is verbatim, conforme to ours.

3. Now, what a world of corruptions haue you committed in this place, euen against the very letter of the text? For 1. this word *stammering*, which is in your owne bible, you haue quite left out, & instead therof haue substituted the word, *another*; what wonderfull difference betwixt these two wordes? 2. Where in the Scripture *lipps* are put first, and *tongue* last, you transferring them, put *tongues* first, and *lipps* last. 3. Where your Bible readeth *tongue* in the singular, you reade *tongues* in the plurall. 4. Where your Bible saith, *he*, that is God him selfe, will speake vnto them with his owne lipps and his owne tongue, you make him to say, that he will speake vnto them with the tongues and lipps of other men. 5. Where both your Bible and ours read, *they would not heare*, you most corruptedly read thus; *and so they shall not heare me.* 6. Besides the words you haue corrupted, you haue added, seauen, or eight seuerall words,

to these two verses, wherof there is neuer an one in the scripture. 7. You haue curtaild and left out, no lesse then twentie, though euery one in your owne translation : and all this, by such vnchristian and indirect dealing, to enforce the place against seruice in an vnknownen tongue. What may the world now say of you *Sir Hum* : who charge other men, with clipping the tongues, and turning about the necks both of scriptures and Fathers, when they speake not as they would haue them? How rightly may I play vpon you with your owne words. pag. 290. *Behould the Reuerence they yeld vnto the scriptures! Is it then any wonder that these men dare doe that to the holy scripture which they durst not doe to a Popes Bull or a Kings proclamation?*

4. If euery one might apply scripture, according to his owne pate, how much more pertinently might these places be pressed, to proue that the diuine seruice of our Lord, ought to be in one tongue thorough all the world? *Leuit. 19. 19. And the earth was of one tongue, and all one speeche. Gen. 11. 1. All the men and women, young men and children being gathered together &c. With one voice. Iudith 7. 12. And all the people answered with one voice. Exod. 24. 3. Be of one mind one towards another according to Iesus Christ; that of one mind, with one mouth, you may glorify God, and the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ. Rom. 15. 5. If therefore the whole Church come together in one &c. What would you haue them to doe in this case? Would you haue them*

Or, the Truly Safe way.

659

them speake euery one in his owne language;
how should they vnderstand one another? And
contrariwise, these againe against your seruice, or
euery seruice in his seuerall tongue. Gen. 11. 17.
Let vs goe downe and confound their tongues. Pl. 54.
10. *Precipitat, o Lord, and deuide their tongues.* &
psal. 30. 21. David prayeth to be deliuered from the
contradiction of tongues. But to drawe to an end of
this dizzie Way.

Sir Humfrey pag. 315.

Are they blessed, that contrary to the law of
God, giue adoration to Images? *Confounded be all
they that worship carued Images,* saith the Prophet
David. psal. 67. 7.

A N S W E R.

1. Then was David him selfe both accursed,
and to be confounded, who willeth vs thus. *Adore
his foot-stoole, because it is holy;* psal. 98. or with you
99. which the Fathers vnderstood of the Arke of
the Testament, and was not that a carued thing?
Then was the Patriarch *Iacob* both accursed and
to be confound, for *worshiping the top of Iosephs
rod.* Heb. 11. Then should *S. Paul* be accursed and
confounded, for willing vs to *bow* or worship at
the *name of Iesus*, for that is the name of Iesus
which, is carued or painted in a picture, as well as
that which is pronounced by the mouth. Lo how
properly you apply scripture to your owne con-
fusion, euen then when you thinke to confound

T t 3

others

others out of scripture!

2. But what Images were those, whereof the Prophet *David* pronounced this sentence? Confounded be all they that worship carued Images? Were they of those of Christ and his Saints, such as we worship this day in the Catholike Church? Were there any such in *Dauids* dayes? Or were they the Images, or rather the Idols of *Iupiter*, *Saturne*, and other false and fayned Gods? You, to vnderprop your false opinion against Christian Images, translate the word *Pesel*, a grauen thing a carued Image, which yet signifies not euery Image whatsoeuer, but only a feyned or forged Image, such as the wicked Gentils vsed. Which the very wordes of the same Prophet sufficiently cleareth, had you but cited them to the end: for thus your owne Bible readeth. *Confounded be all they that serue grauen Images, that boast them selues of Idols.* Lo what Images the Prophet *David* exclaimeth against, to wit, such as they made Idols of: and can you not distinguish betwixt an Image and an Idol? God made man after his owne Image. Christ was the Image of his Fathers substance. Your selues make the Image of the King and Queene. Was man the Idol of God? Christ the Idol of his Fathers substance? or are those Images, the Idols of the King and Queene? How absurd were it so to imagine! An Image is godlie: an Idol is damnable. Images we haue: Idols we hate, as much as you. You can neuer proue that to worship the Image of *Iesw* Christ, is contrary to the law

law of God, or to make an Idol of it. When you goe about to proue that, turne to the place where I haue proued you make an Idol, and comit Idolatrye, euery time you admit the Image of Christ into your minde; and hauing admitted it, fall thereupon to pray, and adore Christ.

Sir Humfrey pag. 316.

Are they blessed, that giue adoration to Saints, and to the creatures of bread and wine? *They that worship the creature, instead of the Creator, God giues them ouer to a reprobate minde; & they are accursed.*

ANSWER.

You abuse the word of God, most abominably. First, these words lie not in scripture, as you haue patched them together. 2. The Apostle *s. Paul* speaketh here against the Idolatrous Gentils, taxing them for that *they changed the glorie of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of a corruptible man, and of foules, and four-footed beasts, and of them that creepe.* Rom. 1. of which (long after) he saith, that *God hath deliuered them vp into a reprobate sense.* Now, do we worship the Saints, in steed of God? Then belike we haue no God at all, nor can not say our common Creed, *I beleue in God?* Or do we change the glorie of God, or of his Saints, into the similitude of foules, and four-footed beasts, and of them that creepe? then haue we as little wit, as the four-footed beast with the long eares. Doe you finde vs such simple fooles? And for adoration

T r 4

giuen

giuen to the creatures of bread, if God him selfe be present there, as we teache he is, then do wee worship God him selfe, and not the creature instead of God. If nothing be there but the creature of bread, yet even then also, Protestants giue adoration to the creature of bread as much as wee; they worship the creature, in steed of the Creator as much as we: they are not blessed, but accursed, as much as wee. For do they not receiue their Communion bread adoring and kneeling vpon their knees, as well as we? Wherin then do wee worship the creature, instead of the Creator, more then they? Now to come to your last.

Sir Humfrey pag. 316.

Are they blessed that adde new Traditions to the Scripture, and detracts from Gods commandements, and Christs institution in the Sacrament? *Cursed be he that addeth or detracteth, from the least of these sayings* (saith the Euangelist.) Are they blessed that create new Articles of faith, *præter quam*, or, *contra quam*, besides, or contrary to the doctrine of the Scriptures? *If an Angell from heauē preach any other gospell, then that you haue receiued, let him bee accursed.* From these few instances, it may easilie appeare, whether thy are damned, which beleeue and receiue the faith which was taught by Christ and his Apostles; or they blessed which obey the Trent Fathers, and their doctrine, which is condemned by the Apostles, and Fathers of the Primitiue Church.

AN-

ANSWER.

1. All you haue here brought, is such flight & forrie stuffe, as serues to litle purpose, vnlesse to retort vpon your selfe. Touching the adding of *new Traditions* to the Scripture, what else may I call it, but a pure calumnie? That your selues haue added *new Additions*, and that in great heapes and hundreds, is so euident in it selfe, as cannot bee excused by any colour, by adding a number of wordes of your owne, intermingled with the sacred Text, pointing them in a different letter, so to intimate the varietie and diuersitie of sundry readings: which the ordinary Reader not much marking, or not considering as hee oughte, is only a subtil slight so to infuse into his soule the poyson of you heresie, the more inperceptable.

2. That there are certaine Traditions receiued and practised both in our Church, and in yours, (yet not in Scripture) I thinke your selfe will not deny: as, making of the signe of the Crosse, kneeling at our Lords prayer, and at receiuing the communion, standing at the reciting of the creed, marrying with a ring, Churching of women, the hauing of a Font, Bells, and Organs, the distinction of habits betwixt a Bishop and a Minister, with many the like. Are these new Traditions added by your Church to the Scripture, yea, or no? If yea? then haue you prettily pronounced a curse vpon your selues, for creating of new Articles. I haue spoken thereof before sufficiently
pag.

pag. 195. The Apostles ordained 12. you haue 39. haue you created new ones, yea, or no? Are they *Besides*, or *Contrary* to the doctrine of the Scriptures? They are both, as hath bene proued: therefore you haue pronounced a curse vpon your selfe. Lastly you say. *If an Angel from heauen, preach any other gospel then you haue receiued, let him be accursed.* But the gospel which you preach now, was it that which you receiued, when you were first conuerted to the faith by B. S. Austin? Nothing lesse; thus you haue pronounced seuerall curses, and produced seuerall thinges, seruing to no purpose at all, but to retort vpon your selfe.

3. And now are we come to that wherein consisteth the maine substance of this *Section*, I shall not neede to repeat the whole: the contents wherof is briefly this. *Whether a Papist, liuing and dying such, may be saued, yea, or no?* You resolue, he cannot, *vnlesse liuing a Papist, be dye a Protestant in the principall foundation of your faith.* And therefore, where as some Protestants, thinke that men may bee saued, liuing and dying in our Church, you oppose this opinion, saying thus.

Sir Humfrey pag. 318.

Surely it were great pittie that a charitable opinion on our part, should giue any Romanist occasion, to liue and dye in the bosome of the Roman Church; whereas wee should rather giue them a warning in the name of the Apostle, *Go out of her my people, that you bee not partakers of her plagues. Reuel. 18. 4.*

A N S W E R.

1. But all your supposed Protestant predecessors, for a thousand yeares and vpwards before *Luther*, liued and dyed in the bosome of the Roman Church (or in the bosome of none.) Ergo they were all partakers of her plagues. Ergo according to your owne doctrine, they were all damned: vnles you can proue vnto me, how a Papist going to hell, and hauing a Protestant buttoned within his bosome, he should to hell, and yet the Protestant goe to heauen. It is a meere *Crabbes*, a meere *Chymera*, a meere *Gobbet* for a Gull to swallow.

2. Touching your application of holy Scripture, you depraue the same, you apply the place most perversly, most impertinently. The quite contrary is forbidden in many places in holy scripture, in no wise to goe out of the Church; what words more plaine then those our Sauour himselfe speaketh? *Mar. 24. 26. If therefore they shall say vnto you. Behould hee is in the desert, goe ye not out. Iohn 15. 6. If any abide not in me hee shall be cast forth as the branche, and shall wither. What wordes more plaine then those the same Apostle speaketh? 1. Iohn 4. 1. Many false Prophets are gone out. And 2. Iohn 1. 7. Many seducers are gone out. What words more plaine then those the Apostle S. Iude 5. 11. speaketh? Woe vnto them which haue gone in the way of Caine, and with the error of Balaam, haue for reward poured out them selues. And*
verse

verse 19. *These are they which segregate them selves.* And 1. Iohn 2. 19. *They went Out from vs, but were not of vs.* What words more plaine then those the Apostle *S. Paul* speaketh? Heb. 2. 1. *Therefore more abundantly ought wee to obserue those things which wee haue heard least perhaps wee runne Out.* And Heb. 10. 23. 25. *Let vs hold the confession of our hope vndeclyning &c. nor forsaking our assemblies as some are accustomed.* And 1. Tim. 4. 1. *And the spirit manifestly saith, that in the last times, certaine shall depart from the faith, attending to spirits of error.*

3. Now, compare all these most expresse places of holy Scripture, against your one, and what comparison? It seemes that our Sauour, *S. Iohn*, *S. Iude* and the Apostle *S. Paul*, addresse their speeches directly against the doctrine of *Sir Hume* who counselleth vs to goe *Out*: they on the contrary to tarry *Within*, which of the two shall we beleue? Againe, hee that goeth *out*, was once *within*: he that segregateth him selfe, he that departeth from the faith, once had the true faith. Wee neuer went *out*, wee neuer segregated our selues, wee neuer departed from your faith. Ergo we neuer departed from you. Contrarywise, you once had our faith, were once in our Church, in our bosome, and the like (as you pretend.) Ergo you went *out*, you segregated your selues, you departed from vs, and from our faith: and so by your owne confession, condemne your selues for flat schismatiques at the least. Againe, *S. Paul* Romans. 1. 13, acknowledgeth him selfe to bee a
 child

childe of the Roman Church, and calleth the faith of Rome his *owne faith*; Now, doubtlesse *S. Iohn* and *S. Paul* were both of one minde in this point: if therfore *S. Iohn* vnderstood this of the Church of Rome, then willed hee *S. Paul* to come out of the Church of Rome, for feare of being partaker of her plagues. To come out of that Church which he was in, which he praised, which hee extolled so far, as to tearme her the most renowned of the world. What poore stufte? What probabilitie? What apparance? But will you see more of the same courlespinning, and how opposite you are to the opinion of other Protestants, who thinke that one may be saued liuing and dying in our Religion?

Sir Humphrey pag. 322.

I must confesse, I doe incline to a charitable opinion of euery poore soule among them, that makes as good vse as he can of the publique and priuat meanes afforded him for sauing knowledg and practise. Nay more, what haue I to doe to iudge another mans seruant, seeing he standeth or falleth to his *owne Master*? *Rom. 14. 14.* But I take God and his holie Angels to witnesse, that had I ten thousand soules, I would not aduenture one of them in the Roman faith, & the Roman Church. And in the verie page before you conclude peremptorily, that none can be saued, vnlesse liuing Papists, they dye Protestants.

AN-

1. Loe *Sir Hum*: your great charity. Loe the charitable opinion you haue of all Papists! O fall your owne Grandfathers and Grandmothers, for these thousand or fifteene hundred yeares before *Luther*, to damne them all, to send them all at once vnto the Diuel! Surely Hell is much behoulding to you. For if *hauing ten thousands soules, you would not venture one of them in the Roman Church*. If you suppose none can bee saued, vnlesse *liuing Papists they dye Protestants*, then no one Protestant being produced by you, in all your Booke, nor able to be produced by you or any other for a thousand yeares before *Luther*, that was Protestant *fully*, in all fundamentall points, *Purely* without admixtion of error, *Orderly* vnder lawfull pastors, *successiuely*, *lineally*, *continually*, *Distinct*, and standing in *opposition* to the Church of Rome, it followes according to your doctrine, that all are damned, all gone to the Diuel before *Luther*, or at least, their saluation to be doubtful: yea euen your supposed Protestants also, who liued and dyed in the bosome of the Roman Church, must needs be damned. Whom allot you, or whom appoint you then, to people heauen? Heauen by this doctrine, is quite and cleane without inhabitants, and wee haue there no Church triumphant. O heauens? O heavenly inhabitants, what say you to *Sir Hum*. *Safe way*? O yee glistering pearles of that seate of glorie, set you fast, for this man would pull you forth of your seates if it were in his power.

2. But

2. But to march forward in this *madde way*. I suppose you will not deny, but that *S. Austen* the Monke, first Archbishop of Canterburie, and our Apostle, liued a Papist, and dyed a Papist (for so *M. Preston* supposeth of him.) That *S. Laurence* his successor, and the second Archbishop of Canterburie, liued a Papist, and dyed a Papist: That *S. Melitus* his successor, and the third Archhishop of Canterburie (an Abbot sent from Rome) liued a Papist and dyed a Papist; That *S. Iustus* his successor, and the fourth Archbishop of Canterburie (who receiued his Pall from the Pope of Rome) liued a Papist, and dyed a Papist: That *S. Honorius* his successor, and the fift Archbishop of Canterburie (who as *Bale* writeth, first deuided England into parishes, *after the Papisticall maner*) liued a Papist and dyed a Papist; That *S. Theodore* the seauenth Archbishop of Canterburie (who as *Bale* witnesseth, appointed *latin boures, latin songes, Masses, Ceremonies, Idolatries, and procession in Churches in latin, Purgatorie &c.*) liued a Papist, and died a Papist: That *Saint Odo*, the 22. Archbishop of Canterbury, *Saint Dunstan* the 23. and *S. Anselme* the 34. all successors of *Saint Austin*, liued Papists and dyed Papists. (*M. Montague* supposeth the same of *Saint Anselme* in particular *Ans. to the Gagge pag. 25.*) besides an infinit number of holy Kinges, holy Queenes, and other Religious men and women, who liued and dyed in diuers religious orders according to the Papists cut, and by comō consent, were canonized for holy Saints.

3. But

3. But to take a view of other contries besides our owne. What say you to *S. Benet* the monke, who liued in the next age after that great light of Gods Church, the glorious Doctor *S. Austin*: and flourished so in euery place, that hee and his had infinit number of Monasteries, in all Christian contries vnder heauen, as the prime peeces of the world do yet beare witness? I suppose you will not say, but that he liued a Papist, and dyed a Papist: not a Protestant. What say you to *S. Romuald Abbot*, who liued about 600. yeares agoe? What say you to *S. Robert Abbot* of Molisme in France, who liued about 500. yeares agoe? What say you to *S. Bernard Abbot*, who him selfe founded a hundred and threescore seuerall Monasteries? What say you to those two great lights of Gods Church, *Bl. S. Francis* and *S. Dominick*, who haue erected many thousand of religious Monasteries of men and women in all Christian contries vnder heauen? What say you to those number of incomparable men that haue, as sprigges, sprouted from them, as *S. Bonauenture*, *S. Thomas of Aquin* (that Angelicall Doctor) *S. Francis of Paula*: and of women, *S. Clare*, *S. Catherin* of Sienna, with infinit more which I omit for breuitie sake, and wherof I shall giue you some further account in our Catholique Catalogue? I suppose you will say no otherwise, but that they all liued Papists, and dyed Papists, no Protestants.

4. This being so, it must needs follow according to your vncharitable censure, that they are
all

all damned, and gone to the Deuill. If those that both in their liues, and after their deaths, were reputed for such glorious Saints, were all damned, what shall wee say of millions of others, who neuer came nere the thousand part of their singular sanctitie? If the Saints be gone to the Diuell, whether are the sinners gone? how much is hell, how little heauen, behoulding to you? If ether all these, from *S. Banes* vnto *Luther*, liuing Papists, & dying Papists, went to heauen, then out of dispute it is, that some Papists are in heauen. If in the bosomes of all of them, or any one of them, there was any particular and indiuiduall man, or woman, who liued a Papist and dyed a Protestar; or rather, who both liued a Protestant, and dyed a Protestant, Fully in all points, Purely without admixtion of damnable error, Orderly vnder lawfull guides and Pattors, Successively one to another from Christ to vs, Distinct and standing in Opposition to the Church of Rome, then we require of you without any more ado, you name vnto vs that particular and indiuiduall man, or woman, lineally descended from father, to sonne, that so at last we may come to finde that which wee haue so long looked for; Where was your Church before *Luther*? Else neither must you thinke with all your craft, ether to stop the mouthes of any Papist, or satisfie the conscience of any vnderstanding Protestant, but that they both will call vpon you, your *Catalogue Sir Hum:* come out with your *Catalogue* your *Butterye booke* of visible Pro-

restant professors in all Ages from Christ to Luther
 Else it is false, else it is a meere deceit which you
 tell vs in your Epistle Dedicatorie; *it is an vndou-
 ted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith
 which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first
 Age, had visible professors in all Ages.* Else it is false
 which the Apoitte teacheth, saying. *And hee gaue
 some Apostles, and some Prophets, and othersome E-
 uangelists, and othersome Pastors and Doctors, to the
 consummation of the Saints (which they could not
 bee, if they held but any one point of damnable
 doctrine:) vnto the worke of the Ministrie (which in
 your sence, could not be in our Massing Priests:)
 vnto the edifying of the body of Christ (which you
 suppose could not bee the Church of Papists:)
 vntill we meete all in the vnitie of faith (which tho-
 rough out the whole, you labour to proue, neuer
 to haue bene amongst Papists: and knowledge of
 the Sonne of God into a perfect man (which you
 expressely deny to be amongst Papists.)* Else Luthers
 profession, shall be my conclusion; *The Argu-
 ments and reasonings of the Sacramentaries, are
 such vaine words, without wit, that I cannot mar-
 uell sufficiently, how learned men can bee moued
 with such lyes. And truly, they do their matters
 with so fearfull a conscience, that they seeme to wishe
 they had neuer taken them in hand: verely I sup-
 pose, if they were to consult of the matter a fresh,
 they would neuer begin.* Thus Luther tom. 7. *De-
 fensio verborum cana. fol. 138.*

Section XVIII.

P *Rowing (according to the Title of the Booke)*
by the confession of all sides, that the Prote-
stants religion is safer, because in all Positive points
of our doctrine, the Romanists them selues agree
with vs, but in their additions, they stand single by
them selues.

ANSWER.

1. O, *Sir Hum.* how stranglie doe you seeke to
 deceiue! And yet how palpable doe you proceed!
 Is it possible to find a Protestant of so dull a spirit,
 such a Buzzard, or so blockish, that cannot now
 without a Tutor discover the deceit, the craft, and
 the fraud of your *via Tuta*? We are now come to
 the last close, to the shetting vp, and last Section
 of all your Booke which should haue shewed vs
 the safe way (so much desired, so much sought for
 of vs, and so faithfully promised on your part) and
 the safest way which yet you haue shewed vs, is,
 to suppose (though you neuer proue it) your Pro-
 testant Church, forsooth, in the Ages before Lu-
 ther, to haue bene inuolued and inbreasted in the
 bosome of the Roman; to haue bene lapped in the
 very bowels of our *owne Romish Bishops, Doctors,*
Cardinals, and other schoolemen: such as liued Pa-
 pists, and dyed Papists, and consequently in your
 iudgement were all damned. This, *Sir Hum.* is

your via Tuta. This is your *Safe Way*, to send all, Tagge and Ragge for a thousand yeares and vpwards before *Luther*, vnto the euerlasting pit of hell. Other Church then this, before *Luther*, you haue not shewed vs. Into to any other, or *safes Way* then this, you haue not led vs. You haue not named one only man, one only indiuiduall person, one only companion in all your booke (a true Protestant in all points of faith before *Luther*) Fully, Purely, and the like, which may accompanie a trauellier seeking for this *safe Way*, besides such as were notoriously known to be our owne *Romish Bishops, Doctors, Cardinalls and other schoolemen*; besides such as liued and dyed in the bosome of that whore of Babilon; in which Church and faith, you take God and his holy Angells to witnesse, that had you ten thousand soules, you would not yet aduenture one of them. Yea you further tell vs pag. 324. from the testimonye of the best learned of your Church, that, *Survey heauen is selfe and all the heauely host: looke well into all the parts and coasts of it whilst you list, you shall not find there, vpon my Word, one Iesuit, or one Papist.*

2. Now is it possible to find any Protestant so dull, so simple, or so sencelesse, that doth not evidently discover the palpable absurditie of this *via Tuta*? The pernicious vncertaintie, and apparant perill of this *safe Way*? Or haue Protestants made such shipwrack of their wits, that they will take the high way to hell, for a *Safe Way* to heauen? Doth not *Sir Hum.* intitle his Booke the *Safe Way*, because

because according to the Challenge made vnto him (Epist. Ded. pag. 2.) he promisetht by himselfe or his friends, to proue out of some good Authors, that the Protestant Church was in all Ages visible, especially in the Ages before Luther? Doth he not vnder- take to make the world to know, that it is no difficult matter for a meane layman to performe this? Now we haue runne ouer his whole Booke, his *via Tuta*, which should haue impathed vs in this *Safe Way*, which should haue led vs, which should haue conducted vs, which should haue shewed vnto vs this *visible Protestant Church*, and *visible Protestant professors* in all ages, but especially in those before *Luther*, *Protestant Fully*, *Purely*, *Orderly*, *Successiuelly*, *Vnanimously*, *Interruptedly*, *Perpetually*, and *Distinct* from that of ours as hath bene tould and inculcated infinit times. I, for my part, haue not found so much as one only, in any, or all the ages before *Luther*; I beseech you therefore Gentlemen and my deare Contrimen all, particularly *M. Skinner*, *M. Boush*, *M. Toby Metberel*, *M. Louel*, and *M. Larder*, for whose sakes I tooke this paines, and for whose sakes I put my selfe to these expences, that, if you haue espyed what I haue not, it would please you to point me to that Section, to that page, to that paragraph, or to that line in all *Sir Hum: Lindes Booke*, that directeth, that addresseth vs vnto that one only Protestant before *Luther*; If you finde but one, if you shew but one, that liued a Protestant, and dyed a Protestant: or that liued a Papist, and dyed a Protestant, Fullie,

Purely, with the other conditions so often required, I yeld vnto you, I subscribe vnto you, I promise vnto you in the presence of God and his holy Angells, to renounce Papistrie, and to become a Protestant, as I was. I will (to vse *Sir Hum.* owne wordes pag. 326.) *reconcile my selfe to the English Church, and creepe vpon all foure, both to him, and to his Grace of Canterburie, to craue a pardon.* Or if you finde him not, nor cannot finde him in all *Sir Hum. via Tuta*, or *Safe Way*, then againe, to vse *Sir Hum.* owne wordes. *Come out of the Reformed (or rather Deformed Church) come out of her my people, that you be not partakers of her plagues* (*Reuel. 18. 14.*) And againe with the same *Sir Hum.* I take God and his holy Angells to witnesse, that had I ten thousand soules, I would not aduenture one of them in the English faith, and English Church. Then againe with the words of the best learned of their owne Church, I say vnto him, and to you all. *Suruey heauen it selfe, and all the beauenly host, looke well into all the parts and coasts of it whilst you list, you shall not finde there, vpon my word, one Protestant, or one Puritan.* For if we cannot finde one visible Protestant professor before *Luther*, here below in the Church militant, how shall we finde him in the Church inuisible, which is aboue, and Triumphant? If you cannot name so much as one here, what madnesse to imagine so many millions there? O sencelesse *Galathians*, who hath thus bewitched you, to beleue such empty bables, such empty buz-zes, such fonde fables, for an assured Article of
your

your saluation!

Sir Humfrey pag. 325.

But admit, the Protestants should allow a possibility of saluation, to all beleeuing Christians, in the bosome of the Roman Church (which neuer yet was granted) what doe our aduersaries inferre from hence? Therfore (say they) *It is the safer way to persist in that Church, where both sides agree, then where one part stands single in opinion by themselves.* Now surely, if that be the safer way, wherein differing parties agree both in one, I will ioyne issue with them in this very point. And if in this I make not good (the Title of my Booke) that wee are therefore in the safer way, because they agree in the principall points of controuersie with our doctrine, I will reconcile my selfe to the Roman Church, and creepe vpon all foure to his holinesse for a pardon.

First then we say, there is a heauen and a hell. It is true, say they, but there is a *Purgatorie*, there is a *Limbus Infantum* also. In the first part they ioyne with vs: in the latter, they stand single by themselves (91. *vntruth.*) And that is the safer way where both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

1, Lord, what a many of fraudes, what a many of shifts and subtile deceits, are shrouded in this sillie discourse! What laying of false foundations according to your ould custome, and then building thereon strange Castles of straw and stuble!

V u 4.

First,

First, we must suppose for points of *Positive* and *Negative* doctrine, what Protestants please; And so we must suppose, that to say, there are *Seauen Sacraments*, the *Saints* and *Angells* are to be praised vnto, Christ is really present in the *Supper*, there is a *Purgatorie*, a *Limbus*, and the like, to be with you all points of *Negative* doctrine: which is quite *Cham*, and quite contrary, euen to comon sense and reason. *Secondly*, we must suppose (if we will belecue *Sir Hum*, when he tells two contrarie tales) that it was *neuer granted*, a *possibilitie* of *saluation* to all beleeuing *Christians*, in the *bosome* of the *Roman Church*. Which yet is *proued*, page 4. page 72. besides in sundry other places out of him selfe, and is the principall drift and discourse of all his trifling *via Tuta*, besides out of sundry other learned Protestants; particularly, and also most learnedly out of *M. D. Kings Legacie*, Motiue 12. and last. *Thirdly*, we must suppose, as vndeniable, *that to be the safer way, wherein differing parties agree both in one*: Now, as I said before, if this be a certaine kind of *Triall*, difference being betwixt *Turkes & Christians*, the *Turke* might thus reply vnto the *Christian*. There is a *Father* and *Holie Ghost*, a *First*, and a *Third* person in the *Trinitie*. It is true say the *Christians*, but there is also a *Second* person which is the *Sonne*, *Consubstantiall*, *Coeternall*, query way *Equall* with the other *Two*; In the first part (saith the *Turke*) they ioyne with vs: in the latter, they stand single by them selues; And what is the safer way where both sides agree, With this

this one Answer, might I easilie blow away, and insatiate at a blast, all the sillie Conceits (or rather subtrill Deceites) of this last section. It is nothing but a litle Sophistrie, and a meere Gobbet, for a Gull to swallow. To shew you therefore that a rich man neede not be a thiefe, I will elude your instances by another cleare and euident way, that so the Reader may see, how sensibly you seeke to deceiue him.

2. To this first instance therefore I answer thus. It is false that *in this later we stand single and by our selues*. For as touching Purgatorie, besides many places of scripture which proue the same, as 1. Cor. 3. 13. & 1. 15. 29. 2. Macab. 12. 44, besides many ancient Fathers which proue the same, we haue these prime and learned Protestants which stand with vs against Sir Hum. Luther him selfe (*that man of God sent to illuminate the whole world*) *Urbanus Regius, Bucer, Latimer*, and the Protestant Communion Booke in K. Edwards time. As hath already bene proued by the learned of our side. Prot. Apologie pag. 690. D. Kinges Legacie pag. 158. And for prooffe of a *Limbus*, or a third place, besides the proofes in the same Apologie pag. *ibid*, your owne English Communion Booke published by comon authoritie, hath this verse in the psalmes or exposition of the Creed, as already hath bene cited.

His soule did after this descend

Into the lower parts,

To them that long in darknesse were,

The true light of their harts.

Which

Which must necessarilye proue a third place besides hell and heaven (call it by what title your selfe please;) and being so, how easilie is your subtile (yet fillie deceit) retorted *Sir Hum*: vpon your selfe? We say there is a heauen a hell, a Limbus, and a Purgatorie. In the first part they ioyne with vs; in the later they stand single by them selues. And that is the safer way where both sides agree. But we haue Protestants which agree with vs in both these points against you: ergo by your owne confession, ours is the safer way. For thame *Sir Hum*, cease to deceiue so sensible.

Sir Humfrey pag. 327.

We say, we shall be saued by the merits and satisfactions of Christ Iesus. It is true say they; but there are likewise merites of Saints, and satisfactions of our owne, helpfull and necessarie to saluation. In the first part they ioyne with vs: in the later, they stand single by them selues (92. *truth*.) And that is the safer way, where both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

To this second instance of *Merits* I answer thus, as to the former, that it is false that we stand single by our selues. For besides abundance of places of sacred scripture which proue both the merits of the Saints, and satisfactions of our owne: besides abundance of authorities of ancient Fathers which proue the same, we haue these prime and learned Protestants which stand with vs against you,

you, namely Doctor *Fulke*, and Doctor *Willet*, cited by D. *Kinge* pag. 159. Doctor *Couel* defence of *Hooker* pag. 42. Doctor *Field* pag. 116. M. *Worson* Defen. of *Perkins* pag. 240. 241. cited in the English Protestant *Recantation* pag. 239. with twenty more that I could name you if need were, euen of our owne learned English Protestants, besides innumerable externes which I name not (for which see *Protr. Apol.* pag. 688. and else where.) Which being so, besides that you suppose for true, what is most false (which I oblige my selfe to proue against you when you please) how easilie is this retorted vpon your selfe? We say; we shall be saued by the Merits and satisfaction of *Christ Iesus*, together with the Merits of Saints, and satisfactions of our owne, as helpfull and necessarie to saluation. In all these parts many Protestants ioyne with vs: they which oppose vs, stand single by them selues. And that is the safer way, where both sides agree. Loe the man that iustifies his Mothers Cause, and his owne Reputation! Loe the man that will make the world to know, how easie a matter it is to stop the mouth of any Papist!

Sir Humfrey pag. 327.

We say, The Sacrament of Baptisme and the Eucharist, are two proper Sacraments instituted by Christ. It is true say they, but there are five more to be receiued, as true & proper Sacraments, *de fide*, for an Article of beliefe. The first two they confesse with vs: in the later five they stand single by

by them selues (93. *vntruth.*) And that is the safer way, wherein both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

It is false, that in the later five we stand single by our selues. For besides the scriptures, Doctor *Humfrey* confesseth that *S. Dionisius* (*S. Pauls* scholar) numbred six Sacraments. *Chemnitius* confesseth *S. Cyprian* to reckon five. *Bale*, in his pageant of Popes, reprehendeth *Innocentius* the first, for that he affirmed *Anoyling* of the sick to be a Sacrament: as is to be seene *Prot. Apologie* pag. 126. 127. *Luther* allowed of three. So did *Zuinglius*, though not the same that *Luther* allowed (*D. Kel. Suruey* pag. 220.) for *Luther* allowed *Penance*, and disallowed *Matrimonic*. *Zuinglius* allowed *Matrimonic*, and disallowed *Penance*. *Caluin* allowed *Orders*, and disallowed the other two allowed by *Luther* and by *Zuinglius*. *Melancthon* allowed of foure. And the softer *Lutherans* at *Lipsia*, allowed of seauen, as *Sleidan* a Protestant, him selfe reporteth. Which being so, thus I retort this sillie shift vpon your selfe. We say, the Sacrament of Baptisme, and the Eucharist, are two proper Sacraments instituted by Christ, as also other five to be receiued *de fide*, as true and proper Sacraments. No say the Protestants now a dayes, there but only two in all; yet *Luther*, *Zuinglius*, *Caluin*, *Melancthon*, with many of the Ancient Fathers, as *S. Dionisius*, *S. Cyprian*, *S. Ambrose*, and *S. Augustine*, confesse more. In the first two they conspire with

vs: in the later they stand single by them selues;
 And that is the safer way where both sides agree.
 Lo, *Sir Hum.* with what a fillie flight, you want
 to haue iustified the title of your *vía Tota!*

Sir Humphrey pag. 328.

We say, That the Images of Christ and his
 Saints, are ornaments and memorials of the ab-
 sent, and may in some Cases serue for historie. It
 is true, say they, but there is also worship and ve-
 neration due vnto them. In the first part they agree
 with vs: in the later, they stand single by them-
 selues (94. *vntruth.*) And that is the safer way,
 where both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

It is false that in the later we stand single by
 our selues, for had we nether Scriptures, ancient
 Fathers, nor Generall Councells for vs, yet wee
 haue *Luther* him selfe and *Brentius* for vs, *Iacobus*
Andreas, *Chemnitius*, *Buchmanus*, *Thomas Bilney* a
 Protestant martyr, and many others, as is to be
 seene in the Protestants Apologie pag. 690. We
 haue more for vs *M. D. Willst*, *D. Couel*, *M. Per-*
kins, *M. Burges*, *M. Wotton*, *M. D. Field* and others
 who in the English Protestant Recantation (Tract.
 of Images) all ingeniously confesse, that the an-
 ciēt Fathers are for vs in this present point. Which
 being so, how can you, *Sir Hum.* say for shame we
 stand alone? And how may wee not iustly retort
 euery word vpon your selfe to your eternall con-
 fusion,

fusion, and ours be truly said to be the safer way?

Sir Humfrey pag. 329.

We say, that Christ is the Mediator and Intercessor betwixt God and man. It is true say they, but the Saints and Angels are our Intercessors & Meditators also. In the first part they ioyne with vs: in the later, they stand single by them selues (94. *vnttruth.*) And that is the safer way, where both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

It is false, *Sir Hum.* and you seeke still to deceiue most sensibly, to say, that in the later we stand single by our selues, when besides the holy scriptures, we haue the testimonies of *S. Augustine*, and of sundry other Saints, yea of *Luther* himselfe. Who saith thus. *Of the Intercession of Saints, I thinke with the whole Christian Church, and iudge the Saints to be honored and inuoked of vs.* Of *Oecolampadius*, of *Thomas Bilney* a Protestēt Martyr, cited in the Protestants Apologie pag. 689. Of *M. Latimer*, Of *D. Barlow*, *D. Wilkes*, *D. Couel*, *M. Perkins* (Prot. Recant. cap. 10.) yea, of *Sir Hum.* himselfe and many moe: who page 323. saith thus. *I take God and his holy Angels to witnesse.* Which in my vnderstanding, is plaine Inuocation of them: for surely by these wordes, you ether ment to make vs vnderstand, that they knew these thinges, wherto you so vehemently inuited them as witnesses, or we must imagine that you intended to make thinges vnderstand, which vnderstand not, and to be made

Wit-

witnesſes of things they know not, which were by far, more abſurd then the former. And thus, by your owne confeſſion (without ſo often repetition of your owne words) ours is ſtill the *Safer Way*.

Sir Humfrey pag. 329.

We ſay, that Chriſt is the head and Monarch of the Church. It is true ſay they, but there is likewiſe another viſible head of the Church which is the Pope. In the firſt part they ioyne with vs: in the later, they ſtand ſingle by them ſelves. (95. *Vntruth.*) And that is the ſafer way, where both ſides agree.

A N S W E R.

It is falſe, *Sir Hum*: and you ſeek ſtill to deceive too too palpably. For beſides that we haue the ſcriptures, Fathers, Councells, and praſtiſe to ſtand for vs in this point, is not his Maieſtie of England, viſible head of the Engliſh, Scottiſh and Iriſh Church enen with you? haue not you then another viſible head beſides Chriſt as well as we? If his Maieſtie had threeſcore kingdomes more, ſhould he not be head of them all, as well as hee is of thoſe three? how groſſly goe you about then to deceive and abuſe your ſimple Reader? Again ſee the Proteſtants Apologie pag. 679. 708. and there you ſhall find that (beſides *Luther* and *Melancthon*) *D. Whitgiſt* Archbiſhop of Canterbury ſtands for vs, and againſt you. *M. Bridges* alſo, Biſhop of Oxford pag. *ibid.* See the Engliſh Proteſtants

testants *Recantation* cap. 3. and there you shall finde *M. Ormerod, D. Downam, M. Middleton. D. Couel, M. Perkins, D. Morton, D. Field*, and many moe to stand for vs, and against you. Apply now your owne Rule, and, if you bee not too vnruely, must neede confesse, that you stand single by your selues in this point of the Popes Supremacie, and consequently, that it is the *Safer way*, to be there where both sides agree. Which is indeed to be imbreasted in our bosome.

Sir Humfrey pag. 330.

We say, that there are two and twentie Bookes of Canonickall Scripture. It is true say they; but there are other bookes also, as namely Toby, Iudith, the Machabes &c. that are Canonickall. In the first parr, they approue all that wee hould: in the later, they stand single by them selues (96. *vntruth.*) And that is the safer way, where both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

You suppose, *Sir Hum:* for true, that which is false, and still seeke to deceiue your ouer-simple Reader, telling him that in this we stand single by our selues. For besides *S. Augustin* and other Doctors of the Church, which stand for vs, wee haue *M. Worron, M. Do. Couel. D. Field. D. Bilson*, and the Conference at Hampron court; as is to be seene in the English Protestant *Recantation* cap. 4. Besides other authorities cited in the Protestant.

Apologie

Apologie pag. 701. wherto I remit you. Do you care then what you say, to say that wee stand single by our selues? or rather may we not therefore retort the same vpon you, that you stand single by your selues? and that therefore it is the *safer way* where both sides agree?

Sir Humfrey pag. 331.

Lastly, wee say there are 12. Articles of the Creed, and this is the Tenet and confession of all Christian Churches. It is true say they: but there are 12. Articles more, published by Pope Pius, the fourth, to be receiued of Catholiques. In the first place, they confesse all that we hould; in the later they stand single by themselves (97. *vntruth*) And that is the safer way, by our Aduersaries confession, where both sides agree.

A N S W E R.

That the Church hath power to declare new Articles of faith, hath already bene handled pag. 199. 206. wherto I remit the gentle Reader. But that in this wee stand single by our selues, is as false as is the former, for it besides the 12. Articles of the Creed, wee haue 12. more added by Pope Pius the fourth, alwayes these other 12. make in all but 24. But Protestants besides these 12. haue many other more then euer were enacted by the Apolltes. The 12. added by Pope Pius (if any were added (as indeed none were) were enacted by a man. Your additions by a woman. The 12. added

X x

by

by Pope Pius, were enacted in a Generall Councell, whereat were assembled 6. Cardinalls 3. Patriarkes, 25. Archbishops, 168. Bishops, 7. Abbots, 7. Generalls of Religions, 39. Procurators, with a great number of other Priests and learned men. I require but a man of common sence, or rather the very childe you speake of a litle before, whether that of Trent with the 12. or that of Westminster with the 27. be to be preferred for authoritie?

Sir Humfrey pag. 332.

Thus by the ample testimonie of the best learned in the Romā Church, there is nothing taught by the Protestants *de fide*, for matter of faith, which the Church of God hath not alwayes held necessarie to be beleeued: nothing but that which alone is sufficiēt for euery Christian man to know concerning his saluation: nothing but that which is confessed by our aduersaries, to be safe and profitable for all beleeuers: nothing but that wherunto the writings of all Antiquity are consonant, and all Christian Confessions agreeable.

A N S W E R.

1. Here in the very end of all, for a friendly farewell, and to captivate the grace of the gentle Reader, we haue the whole closed vp with a number of *Nothings*, one in the neck of another, the most proper Motto (*Sir Hum.*) you could haue chosen to conclude withall: for that in very deed you haue performed only this, and *Nothing* but this;

this; that is to say, iust *Nothing* of all your promised vndertaking. Lets bring them one by one vnto the Touchstone, to trie their substance and soliditie. Those *Nothings* are in number foure, the first wherof is this that followeth.

2. Thus by the ample testimonie of the best learned in the Roman Church, there is *Nothing* taught by the Protestants de fide, for matter of faith, which the Church of God hath not alwayes held necessarie to be beleueed. Lord what a number of vntruths are included in this first *Nothing*, which seemes to be *Nothing* but vntruthes! The 1. is, that the best learned of the Roman Church, doe testifie in the behalfe of the Protestants; Where a whole number of Protestants are presupposed, and yet not one indiuiduall man in the whole world, hath bene hitherto, or can be named. If this can be done, name that *One* now. Name him *Only* in this *One* place. Name but *One* amongst all you haue named in your whole booke, from the first leafe, to the last line; I say, Protestant Fully, Purely &c. without intermixture of damnable error (especially in the first, second, or third Ages before *Luther*) and for that *One* good Protestants sake, I freely quic you and exempt you of all the rest, even from the foaling of *Martin*, to the coming of the *Messias*. Can we aske you lesse then this? Can you refuse to answer this? Can any Protestant rest quiet in conscience, till you do performe this? The best and least I can say therof, vntill you do this, is, both that it is the 98. *vntruth*, and that you haue promi-

sed, but haue performed, *iust nothing.*

3. The next is, that the best learned of the Roman Church, giues this testimonie of *the Church of God*; that is, testifies some other Church besides herselfe, to be the true Church of God. Where note, that a *Church of God* is supposed, but none named. One false, is named, but none true. The Church of Rome is particularly specified, but no other particular Church, ether of England, France, Scotland, or any *Specificall* or *Individuall* Church in the whole world. Now this supposed *Church of God*, was ether the Church of one only Nation and People, as that of the Iewes (whose Church was called by the name of *Ierusalem*) or it was a Church composed of many Churches, wherof some one head or Capitall Church, boare the Name and Title of the whole. If the first, yet still must it needes haue some particular name, as that of that Ancient people had. If the second; then amongst many, one at least (for example the head or Mother of the rest) can be named. If this can be performed by any Protestants, then nowe or neuer, name vnto vs that *One Church*. Name only *One* in this one *Place*. Name vs but *One* amongst all the Churches, and all the Nations vnder heauen (especially in the Ages before *Luther*) Protestant *Fully, Purely, &c.* and standing in Opposition to that of *Rome*, and for that one good Protestant Churches sake, I freely pardon you all the rest. Can we aske you lesse then this? Can you refuse to answer this? Can any

any Protestant be quiet in conscience till you have performed this? Or if there be none such to be named in the whole world, then what is this but, like the former, that the best learned of the Roman Church, must be imagined to give testimonie in your behalfe, of that which is not in esse, or at all: which is to give testimonie of iust Nothing. Who euer heard since the world stood of such a testimonie? How can we lesse doe, then testifie this for the (99. vnttruth?)

The next is, that the best learned of the Roman Church doe give (not euery, but) an *Ample testimonie*, that nothing is now taught by Protestants in the Church of God, for matter of faith, but what was formerly taught in the ancient Church. Now, to give an *Ample testimonie*, is to bring many witnessess, and to produce both many and those most euident, cleare and conuincing authorities. But hath the learned of the Roman Church, performed this in such *Ample* maner as you pretend? Can they give an *Ample testimonie*, that those did teache, who nether taught others, nor were them selues in being to be taught? What schoole call you that, wherein nether any Master, nor scholler was? How taught they in the Church of God, who nether were Teachers, nor yet were taught? who nether were within, nor yet without the same Church? Giue vs but *One* testimonie, *Ample* or other, of any one Protestant teacher, or Protestant scholler; within, or without the Church of God, especially in the Ages before Luther,

and for that one good testimonies sake, I freely forgive you all the rest. If you cannot do this, why promise you so *Ample* and so prodigally, and performe so sparingly? How is not this to utter a (100. *truths*) in most *Ample* maner? Or to tell vs an *Ample* tale, of iust *nothing*?

5. The next that the best learned of the Roman Church must testifie for them, is, that what Protestant teache at this present, was *Alwayes* taught in the Church of God. Now for vs to testifie this, we must particularly haue enumerated Protestants, at least in euery Age and Centurie from Christ to *Luther*, as *M. Preston* (much more honestly then *Sir Ham:*) hath attempted to doe, but not performed. Nor yet only hee, but no Protestant that euer was, is, or is to come to the worlds end, is able to doe, for so much as the next Age only before *Luther*, which being a truth so vnderstandable, how shall we Papists do this for them, which they are not able to doe for them selues? How shall we be able to testifie in their behalfe that they taught *Alwayes* in the Church of God, that is to say, in all Ages, when nor we, nor they, nor any mortall man, is able to doe it for one Age alone? When as they pretend, that for many Ages, there were no such Papists in all the world as we are now? When as we (not pretend but) proue, that there were no such Protestants in all the world, as they are now? Trulie, they may as well produce our testimonie, yea our *Ample* testimony, that there were the selfe same Protestants in profession

feſſion that are now, *Alwayes* and in all Ages, before any men, or yet the world it ſelfe was made, as to produce the teſtimonie of the learned of our Church, to proue that there was ſo much as one man of the ſame Religion before *Luther*. If you (*Sir Hum*) or any proteſtant can do this, name vs now without any more adoe, that *One Age* a part from the reſt. Name vs that that *One Age*, in this only place. Name vs but *One Age*, amongſt all the Ages from the Age of our laſt conuerſion, to *Luthers* reuolt (but Proteſtant Fully, Purely &c. without admixtion of damnable error) and for that one Ages ſake, I freely exempt you of all the reſt. Can any Papiſt aſke you leſſe then this? Can you with any reaſon, reſuſe to anſwer this? Can any Proteſtant quiet his owne conſcience, till you haue performed this? Then when he asketh; *Where was your Church before Luther?* Giue him a iuſt *nothing* to appeaſe him with all. And now to ſay ſomewhat of your ſecond *nothing*.

6. *Nothing but that which alone is ſufficient for euery Chriſtian man to know concerning his ſaluation.* This is the 2. *Nothing* which the beſt learned of the Roman Church muſt teſtifie in the behalfe of Proteſtants, to wit, that to belecue Proteſtants had a viſible Church, viſible Profeſſors, and viſible Teachers in all Ages for a thouſand yeares and vpwards before *Luther*, and yet to be neither ſeene, felt, heard, nor vnderſtood no more then a *nonne Adieuſine*, I ſay, to beleene this for a very certaine and vndouted truth, and yet not to know this, that

is to beleue *something*, and to know *nothing*, this knowledge alone, is *nothing* but that, which alone is sufficient for every Protestant for his saluation. Is this that you would haue our learned testifie in your behalfe?

7. Again; If you teach nothing but that, which is alone sufficient for every Christian mans saluation, and all that by your owne confession, Papists should and teach as well as you, how comes it to passe then, that they cannot be saued as well as you? the other things that they should & teach more then you, being but points of indifferency, and compatible with saluation, in the iudgement of the best learned of your owne side, as is auerred by D. King in his 12. Motiue, and confessed by your selfe out of Bellarmine, that the *Twelve Articles of the Creed*, the *Ten Commandements*, and *some few of the Sacraments*; these things are *simple necessarie and profitable for all men*; the rest are such, as a man may be saued without them. So that to testifie this, is to testifie in *nothing* for you against vs; & thus much of your 2. *nothing*. Your 3. is.

8. *Nothing but that which is confessed by our aduersaries, to be safe and profitable for all beleeuers.* To know that which is safe and profitable to all beleeuers, must be to know what one knowes, not with an humane, but with a diuine faith. But all learned Romanists, affirme Protestants to knowe *nothing* at all with a diuine, but only with a humane faith. Therefore, our testimonie is, that Protestants know *nothing* at all, either safe or profitable

ble to their saluation, at least with a diuine faith. This is your 3. *nothing*. Now to your fourth and last *nothing*.

8. *Nothing but that wherunto the writings of all Antiquitie are consonant, and all Christian Confessions agreeable.* Here are a number of *Alls*, and a number of *Nothings*, and *all but nothing*. For of all these *writings of Antiquitie*, of all these *Christian Confessions*, name vs but one only *Writing*, name vs but one only *Confession*, in any one, or in all Ages before *Luther*, for a thousand yeares and vpwards, which iustifie all the 39. Articles of your English faith, Fully in all points, Purely without admixtion of damnable error &c. or any one *Writing*, or one *Christian Confession* that opposed in any one, or all those Ages, all those Articles of our faith which you oppose in your *Via Tuta*, and I will acknowledge that you haue iustified the Title of your book; I will acknowledg that you haue shewed vs a *Safe Way*. I will acknowledge that you, as a child of Truth, haue vindicated your Mothers cause, and your owne Reputation. But if you name not this one *Writing*, if you name not, nor canot name, this one *Christian Confession*, by a plaine, particular, specificall, and indiuiduall name, then pardon me if I plainly tell you, that you haue tould vs iust *nothing*, besides sundry palpable and plaine vntruths: and that we are as far to seeke as euer we were, to know for certaine; *Where was your Church before Luther?*

Sir Humfrey pag. vlt.

Now since I haue brought you into *Viam Tutam*, I will briefly commend vnto you Christ and his Apostles for your Leaders, the Ancient Fathers for your Associates and Assistants: and the blessed Spirit, for your Guide and Conductor in your way. There are other Passengers likewise (*viz.*) Cardinals, Bishops, and Schoolemen, which do accompany you part of your way: but they are strangers, and therefore be warie of them; *And by way of preuention*; Stand in the wayes, and see, and aske for theould pathes; Where is the good way? And yee shall finde rest for your soules.

A N S W E R.

1. Rightly *Sir Hum*: in this last close of your *Via Tuta*, do you recommend your Readers to Christ the Sonne of God, and to the holy Spirit for his Conductor; for besides inuisible Spirits, you haue no visible professors of your Religion, nor any passenger of your profession, especially in the Ages before *Luther* (according to the true state of the question, and the Iesuits Challenge, which you dissemble) to keepe them companie in their way. And so, by way of preuention, you aduise them to stand in the wayes, wherein neuer none stood: so see, that which neuer mortall eye beheld: to aske for the old pathes and the good way, neuer telling of whom they are to make this Demand, especially in the Ages before *Luther*; And
so

so instead of giuing the bottome of Thrid which the Poets saigne *Ariadne*, to haue giuen vnto *Theseus*, for his better guiding in that Labyrinth, you send vs to walke in a Circle, which bringes vs backe againe to the same place where we were, when first we vndertooke our iorney. Let the different Reader now iudge, what probabilitie there is, of impathing himselfe in such a deceitfull *Safe way*, or what sence there is, to runne so restles a race to seeke for rest?

2. Now, for as much as Mineralists, extract and draw vapors and waters out of Stones and metall, to the admiration of many men, sith we cannot get a Catalogue out of *Sir Hum*: with his owne free accord nor our importunat calling on him, we will trie if we can extort one out of him by the art of extraction, as forcedly and against his will. To performe this, I will reduce into a Catalogue, all the names of those particular persons, which he hath cited in his *Via Tuta*, without so much as wittingly omitting one; these I will deuide into three seuerall Tables; The first wherof shall containe the Names of those visible Professors, which liued within the first six hundred yeares next ensuing after Christ. The second, the Names of those, which liued from thence to the dayes of *Luther*. The third, the names of all those, who liued from *Luthers* dayes vnto these of ours, that so, to vse your owne words, *the World may see*, how far you are from satisfying the Challenge sent vnto you, or performing your vndertaken taske. Of the first
sort,

fort, are these that follow.

The Names of those visible Professors cited in the Via Tuta, which lived within the first six hundred yeares, next ensuing after Christ.

Theodoret. S. Austen. S. Ierom. S. Basil. Epiphanius. S. Ambrose. S. Ireneus. S. Leo Pope. S. Isidore. S. Athanasius. Iustinian. S. Cyprian. S. Chrysostome. S. Cyrill. Pope Alexander the first. S. Hylarie. S. Gregorie Pope. Eusebius. Therasius. S. Ignatius Martyr. Origen. Tertullian, and Prudentius: *three and twentie* in the whole. But all these lived within those pure Ages, wherein *M. Iewell*, and other the best learned of your side, suppose the Church of Rome to have persevered in her primitive puritie; Shee and you, to be but one; To be *two Sisters*, both descended of one and the same Catholike Mother of vs all. These therefore are to be let passe, as nothing to our present purpose.

The Names of those visible Professors cited in the Via Tuta, which lived from the first six hundred yeares, unto the dayes of Martin Luther.

Michael Cæcenas a Franciscan Friar. Pope Alexander the fift. Genebrard. Platina. Cornelius Agrippa, a Coniurer. Vespergensis. Cardinall Cusanus. Beletus. Nicholaus Clemangis. Maiora Scotchman. Scotus a Franciscan Friar. Pope Adrian the sixt. S. Anselme a Popish Archbishop. Aelfricus Abbot. Lyranus a Franciscan Friar. Gabriel Biela Popish Deane. Odo Cameracensis a Popish Archbishop. Christophorus Archbishop
of

of Cesaria. Cardinall Hugo. Pope Innocent the third. Mycrologus. Hales a Franciscan Friar. Paschasius an Abbot. S. Bernard Abbot. S. Bonaventure a Franciscan Friar and Cardinall: Altifidorus, a learned scholeman of ours. Pope Martin the fift. S. Thomas of Aquin a Dominican Friar, Haymo, a Benedictin Monke. Waldensis, a Carmelit Friar, who wrote most learnedly against Wickliffe. Honorius, a Catholique Author. Agobardus, a Popish Archbishop of Lyons. Hincmarus, Monke. & a Popish Archbishop of Rhemes. S. Antoninus, a Dominican Friar. S. Bede, a Monke of S. Bennets. Panormitan Abbot. Pope Pius the second. Vdalricus, Bishop of Augutta. Bertram a Benedictin Monke. Gerson a French man. Cardinall Bessarion a Grecian, *forty one* in the whole. Which, considering how many Kingdomes and Nations were now Christian, were scarce enough to be produced for the visible professors in one only Age; how triuiall then for you, to bring them (they being so few, and so out of order) for nere a thousand yeares before *Luther*?

The Names of those visible Professors, cited in the Via Tuta, which liued since Luther, or since his dayes, so these of ours.

Ledeima, Iesuit. Cardinall Bellarmine, Iesuit. Campian, Iesuit. Doctor Harding, who wrote sundry learned Bookes against M. Iewel. Ludouico Viues. Cardinall Baronius. Alphonsus a Castro, a Franciscan Friar. Dominicus a Soto, a Dominican Friar. Ribera, Iesuit. M. Hooker, a Protestant.

tessant Cassander of Cullen, an heretique, or at
 least a Schismatick. Cambden, an English Chron-
 nicler, Du Moulin, a French Minister. Phillip
 Mornay a Frèch Hugenote. Popé Paul the fourth.
 Paulus Vergerius, a ranck heretick. Causabon. M.
 Iewell. The Lord Cooke. Bishop Gardner, a Po-
 pish Prelat. Ruardus Tapper Deane of Louaine.
 Pighius. Sleidan. Osiander. Maldonat Iesuit. Fe-
 rus, a Dominican Friar. Marius, a Canon of Cul-
 len. Erasmus of Rotterdame. Gregory of Valencia,
 Iesuit. Wolphius a Suisse heretick. M. Francis
 Mason. K. Edward the sixt. Queene Elizabeth.
 Bishop Fisher of Rochester. Sir Thomas Moore.
 Doctor Sanders, who wrote learnedly against M.
 Iewell, and other Protestants. Roxias, a Spaniard.
 D. Vther. D. Iames. D. Whitakers. D. Billson.
 D. Fearly. D. Fulke. Sir Edwin Sandes. D. An-
 drewes (eight English Protestants.) Salmeron Je-
 suit. Suarez, Iesuit. Cardinall Caietan, a Domi-
 nican Friar. Bishop Tunstall. Cochleus, Deane.
 Iacobus Hofmeisterus. Vasques, Iesuit. Canus, a
 Dominican Friar. Tyrabosco. Ioannes Arboreus,
 a French man. M. Fisher, Iesuit. Author of the
 historie of Trent in English, thought to be Marc
 Antonie de Dominis the Italian Apostat. Gretse-
 rus, Iesuit. Peresius Auila, a Spaniard. Wicelius,
 a Danish Lutheran. Cardinall Gropperus. Silue-
 ster Prierias, a Dominican. Guicciardine, a poli-
 tique Italien. Cunerus, a Reader of Louaine. D.
 Scapleton, who wrote many learned and huge vo-
 lumes against Protestants. Ioannes Pappus, a Lu-
 theran

theran of Strasbourg. Largus, another Lutheran. Lindanus. Scomborge. Cardinall Hosius. And Boxhorne, not Deane of Louaine, which I thinke he neuer was, but Minister of Breda, when it was lately recouered by the K. of Spaine, who ran away from vs, in company of a lewed Nunne, so to augment the number of your Reformed bretheren, amounting in the whole to *Seauentie one*.

Now, having shewed why those in the first Table, next ensuing after Christ, are not to be vr-
ged by you, as nothing to our present purpose: to these *Seauentie* likewise from *Luther* to vs, for the selfe same reason, are to be spunged and reiect-
ed, as not satisfying ether Catholiques in generall, nor the *Iesuits Challenge*, in particular, vrging and pressing you for the production of such, especially as liued in the Ages before *Luther*. All those therefore in the *first*, and *third* Table, are to be esteemed as nothing, but to be all dashed out with a *Deleantur*, and those only in the second Table, in number only *fortie one*, are to stand, as of which the question is, whether they were Protestants yea, or no, *Fully*, in all points; *Purely*, without admixtion of damnable error; *Orderly*, vnder lawfull Pastors; *Perpetually*, without note of manifest change; *Distinct* and standing in Opposition to the Church of Rome. In a word, that *Reformed, pure,* and *unspotted Sister* of which you speake, & which according to that so oft repeated *undoubted Truth,* and *subscribed by both parties*, held that *faith* which Christ and his Apostles taught in the *first Age,* and
had

had visible Professors in those nine or ten Ages before Luther.

This premised, I vrge you, I presse you, I instantly pray you, and coniure you, as you are a Gentleman and a Knight, as you are a Christian, and haue vndertaken to oppose error, and to propugne the Truth, out of these *fortie* visible Professors, to Name, to single out one in particular amongst the rest, which you will assert, and which you will warrant to be such a Protestant. Doing this, if I doe not confound you, if I doe not conuince the contrary, to your euident and eternall shame, or any other which shal vndertake the defence hereof, then doe I freely offer to renounce my Religion, to become once againe a Reformed Protestant as I was, and to creepe of all four vnto you, to craue a pardon. Or if you cannot doe this, if you cannot single or name so much as one, out of all those *fortie* your selfe haue cited, for nine hundred yeares and vpwards, what an emptie blast? What a buzze? How vaine a brag, how frothy a bable? How fond a fable to tell vs, that you would make *the World to see*, that you are neuer able to shew? That you would meeete your *Adversarie vpon his owne ground*? Deale with him *at his owne Weapons*? Extort an ample testimonie from *your enemies*, to make good the visibilitie of your Church? *Vindicate your Mothers cause and your owne reputation*? Where neither giuing, nor being able to giue, naming, nor being able to name, so much as one individuall and particular person, for so many

many hundred yeares together before **Luther**, Protestant **Fully**; **Purely** without mixtion of damnable error; **Distinct**, and standing in opposition to the Church of Rome, what are all these but so many vntruths? so many emptie blasts? so many emptie bubbles? And your **Safe Way**, a pernicious path, to catch and eninare the soules of the simple, that cannot deserue Chawke from Cheese, perfect monie from counterfet coyne, nor Catholique veretie, from hereticall falsity?

Hauiing seene your Catalogue, it is next but reason (and according to promise) that we shew our owne, which is this that ensueth.



**A Catalogue of diuers visible professors of the Catho-
lique Roman faith: taken out of the Appendix of
A. De Vries M. Antonie Wotton, and
M. Iohn White Ministers.**

From the yeare 30. vnto the yeare 100.

Chiefe Pastors.
Iesus Christ. S. Peter Apostle. Linus. Cletus.
Clemens.

The Hierosolymitan Councell. Act. 15.
Catholique Professors.

The blessed Virgin Marie. S. Iohn Baptist. S.
Iohn Apostle and Euangelist, with the other Apo-
stles and Euangelists. Martha. Mary Magdalene. S.
Paul Apostle. Stephen the first Martyr. Timothy.
Barnabas. Tecla. Dionysius Areopagita. Martia-
tialis. And others.

Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Phi-
lippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Hebrewes, and
other dispersed through all Countreies where the Apo-
stles and Apostolike men preached, so wit, in Italy,
Spain, France, England &c.

From the yeare 100. vnto the yeare 200.

Chiefe Pastors.
Anacletus. Euaristus. Alexander. Sixtus I. Te-
lesphorus. Higinus. Pius I. Anicetus. Soter. Eleu-
therius. Victor I.

Catholique Professors.
Ignatius. Eustachius. Hermes. Gerulius. Poly-
carpus.

carpus. Concordius. Iustintus. Eusebius. Vincen-
tius. Pantenus. Irenæus. Potentianus. Narcissus.
Potamiena. Sophia. Spes. Fides. Charitas. Felici-
tas *with her seven children*. Dionysius Corinth.
Peregrinus. Lucius King of England. Andochius.
Agrippinus, and innumerable others.

*Many Indians converted by Pantenus. See Baronius
in Annales and Martyrologe.*

From the years 200. into the years 300.

Chiefe Pastors.

Zephyrinus. Calixtus I. Urbanus I. Pontianus.
Anterus. Fabianus. Cornelius. Lucius. Stepha-
nus I. Sixtus II. Dionysius I. Felix I. Eutychia-
nus. Caius. Marcellinus.

Catholique Professors.

Simplicius. Calepodius. Abdon. Sennen. Pa-
machius. Tiburtius. Valerianus. Verianus. Mar-
cellinus. Dorotheus. Gordianus. Polieuctus. Po-
tentiana. Triphon. Blasius. Maximianus. Cle-
mens. Barbara. Agatha. Apollonia. Cyprianus.
Hippolitus. Gregorius Thaumaturg. Pôcius. Lau-
rentius. Thyrsus. Cæcilia. Victorius. Polychro-
nius. Nemestius. Olympius. Crispinus. Crispinia-
nus. Adrianus. Eubolus. Georgius. Irene. Chro-
nia. Pantaleon. Agnes. Iulitta. Gordius. Barlaam.
Gereon *with his companions*, Cosmas. Damianus.
Mauritius, *with the Thebean Legion*, and others *with-
out number*.

From the yeare 300. vnto the yeare 400.

Chiefe Pastors.

Marcellus. Eusebius. Melchiades, Siluester I. Marcus. Iulius. Liberius. Felix II. (*Liberius was first before Felix, and secondly after Felix.*) Damasus. Siricius. Anastasius I.

The first Nicene Councell, hauing in it 318 Fathers, vnder Pope Siluester against Arius the Heretique.

The first Constantinopolitan Councell, hauing in it 150. Fathers vnder Damasus Pope, against Macedonius the Heretique.

Catholique Professors.

Domnus with 2000. Martyrs. Lucianus. Theodorus the first Eremite. Milles. Iacobus Nisibitanus. Spiridion. Macarius. Nicolaus. Helene mother to Constantine. Constantine Emperour, by whose meanes Christian Religion did wonderfully flourish. Marcus Arethusius. Nicetas. Theodorus. Antonius. Hilarion. Arrenus. Athanasius. Martyrius. Paulus Constantinop. Hilarius. Martianus. Pachomius. Gregorius Nazianz. Ephreem. Didimus. Macarius. Nicetius. Basilus. Pacianus. Mutius. Prudentius. Ambrosius. Hieronymus. Epiphanius. Briuius. Cyrillus Hierosolym. Euphrasia. Blefilla. Amphilochius.

The conuerted Dacians, Geres, Besites, and Scythians, Morins, and Nervians, of whom Paulinus writeth. The Armenians, and Huns, and those troupes of Monks

Monkes of India, Persia, Ethiopia, of which S. Hierome writeth, and infinit others.

From the yeare 400. vnto the yeare 500.

Chiefe Pastors.

Innocentius I. Sozimus. Bonifacius I. Celestinus I. Sixtus III. Leo Magnus. Hilarius. Simplicius. Felix III. Gelasius I. Anastasius II. Symmachus.

The Ephesine Councell hauing in it 200. Fathers vnder Celestine Pope, against Nestorius the Heretique.

The Calcedon Councell hauing in it 630. Fathers vnder Leo Pope, against Eutiches the Heretique.

Catholique Professors.

Seuerinus. Tigrius. Exuperius. Eutropius. Ioannes Chrysostom. Paulinus. Mauritius. Augustinus. Maximus. Sisimus. Vincentius Lyrin. Iacobus Persa. Alexius. Cyrillus Alexandrinus. Ursula with 11000. Virgins. Prosper. Honoratus. Rusticus. Palladius. Germanus. Bonifacius. Euthymius. Simeon Stelites. Chrysologus. Patricius. Germanianus. Proclus. Remigius. Vedastus. Albinus. Eugenius. Vigilus. Fulgentius. Boerius. Epiphanius Ticinensis. Nilus. Seuerinus. Theodosius Abbas.

The Scots conuerred by Palladius. The French conuerred by Remigius and Vedastus. 4979. Martyres and Confessors of Africa, and many others.

From the yeare 500. vnto the yeare 600.

Chiefe Pastors.

Hormisdas. Ioannes I. Felix IV. Bonifacius II. Ioannes II. Agapetus. Siluerius. Vigilus. Pelagius I. Ioannes III. Benedictus I. Pelagius II. Gregorius Magnus.

The second Constantinopolitane Councell, hauing in it 165. Fathers, vnder Pope Vigilus, against Anabaptism and Theodorus.

Catholique Professors.

Gerardus. Genouefa. Columbus. Oportuna. Germanus Parisiensis. Maria Egyptiaca. Brigitta. Simeon Salus. Leander. Benedictus Institutor of the Order of Benedictine Monkes. Rupertus. Maurus. Placidus. Arnulphus. Launomarus. Rade-gundis. Leonardus. Hospitius. Gallus. Columbanus. Ioannes Clymacus. Goar. Ermingildus. Isaac. Felix. Quiriacus. Fortunatus. Tetricus. Agricola. Auitus. Bonifacius. Cassius. Victor. Cerbonius. Crocildis. Dacius. Eleutherius. Firminus. Lantus. Nicerius. Pretextatus. Quintianus. Euphronius. Eufychius. Gregorius Turonensis. Medardus. Dalmatius. Paternus. Mellitus. Sabbas, and others.

Augustine the Monke, who sent by Pope Gregory conuered England: The Northern Picts, the Gothes, the Bauarians, Barbaricians, and Burgundians were conuered in this age.

From

From the year 600. unto the year 700.

Chiefe Pastors.

Sabinianus. Bonifacius III. Deus-dedit. Bonifacius IV. Honorius. Seuerinus. Ioānes IV. Theodorus I. Martinus I. Eugenius. Vitalianus. Adeodatus. Domnus I. Agatho. Leo II. Benedictus II. Ioannes V. Conon. Sergius.

The third Constantinopolitane Councell, holding in it 290. Fathers vnder Pope Agatho against the Monothelites.

Catholicus Professors.

Anastasius Perfa. Walburga. Arala. Eustasius. Ioannes Eleemosynarius. Isidorus. Claudius Bigunt. Theodorus. Arnulphus. Aldegond. Eligius. Seuerus. Cæsarius. Bauo. Maximus. Trudo. Oswaldus. Andoenus. Lambertus. Gaugericus. Anhelmus. Betulphus. Berta. Cunibertus. Aidanus. Cuthbertus. Iulianus. Marinus. Bercharius. Eugenius. The two Ewaldies. Andonius. Damianus Tiemensis. Kilianus. Ioannes Bergomensis. Willebrordus. Aldagifus. Ceadda. Maxellendis. Proiectus. Paulinus. Wikfridus. Eoilburga. Leodigarius. Suibertus. Valericus Nice-tius. Vitranus, and others.

The Flemings conuerred by Eligius. The Westphalians conuerred by the two Ewaldies. The people of Franconia conuerred by Kilianus. Multitudes of Spaniards conuerred by Andonius. The Frizians conuerred by Willebrord.

From the years 700. vnto the years 800.

Chiefe Pastors.

Ioannes VI. Ioannes VII. Sisimus. Cōstantinus.
Gregorius II. Gregorius III. Zacharias. Stephanus
II. Stephanus III. Paulus I. Stephanus IV. Adria-
nus. Leo III.

*The second Nirene Councell, hauing in it 350. Fa-
thers, vnder Pope Adrian, against Image breakers.*

Catholique Professors.

Venerable Bede. Bonitus. Grimoaldus. Guth-
lacus. Ioannes Damascenus. Germanus. Wino-
cus. Hermingildis. Bonifacius. Sebaldu. Plectru-
dis. Wandergillus. Lioba. Iodocus. Pirminus.
Odilia. Gertrudis. Hubertus. Aigilolphus. Lul-
lus. Burchardus. Rigobertus. Gangolphus. Gu-
dula and others.

*The Hættis, Thuringians, Frphordians, and Cat-
tians conuersted by Boniface the English Monke. The
Lombards conuersted by Sebaldu. The Idwes of the Cit-
tie of Berishum being cōuersted by the bleeding of a Cru-
cifix which was stabbed by them contumeliously, the
blood wherof cured all diseases, as Cranzius testifieth
in Metropol. l. 1. c. 9. The two Saxon Dukes, Wiskin-
dus and Albion conuersted by a miraculous sight scene
by Wiskindus, to wit, a faire child descending from the
Priests hands into the mouth of them that receiued the
holy Sacrament.*

FROM

From the yeare 800. vnto the yeare 900.

Chiefe Pastors.

Stephanus V. Paschalis I. Eugenius II. Valentinus. Gregorius IV. Sergius II. Leo IV. Benedictus III. Nicolaus I. Adrianus II. Ioannes VIII. Martinus II. Adrianus III. Stephanus VI. Formosus. Bonifacius VI. Stephanus VII. Romanus.

The fourth Constantinopolitane Councell, hauing in it 300 Fathers, vnder Adrian the second Pope, against Photius.

Catholique Professors.

Sabinus. Ansgratus. Ludgerus. Gerfridus. Geroldus. Ioannicius. Ida. Nicetas. Monolphus. Withgungus. Adelradus. Meruardus. Rumoldus. Ansgarus. Rembertus. Swithinus. Atalpus. Se-finandus, and others.

The Danes and Swethens conuerted by Ansgratus. The Bulgareans conuerted by Ioannicius. The Rugians conuerted by the Monkes of Corbeia. The Morauians conuerted by Withgungus. The Russites conuerted by a Priest sent by the Emperour Basilus.

From the yeare 900. vnto the yeare 1000.

Chiefe Pastors.

Theodorus II. Ioannes IX. Benedictus IV. Leo V. Christophorus. Sergius III. Anastasius II. Lando,

do. Ioannes X. Leo VI. Stephanus VIII. Ioannes XI. Leo VII. Stephanus IX. Martinus III. Agapetus II. Ioānes XII. Benedictus V. Ioannes XIII. Dōnus II. Benedictus VI. Benedictus VII. Ioannes XIV. Ioānes XV. Ioannes XVI. Gregorius V. Siluester II.

Catholicus Professors.

Odo Cluniacensis. Wencefflaus. Adalricus. Bruno Colonienfis. Guibertus Maiolus. Dunstanus. Romoaldus. Elphegus. Adelheides. Wolfgangus. Poppo. Berualdus. Adelbertus. Ægidius Tusculanus, and others.

The Polonians conuerted by Ægidius Tusculanus sent by Pope Iohn the XIII. The Sclauonians conuerted by Adelbert. The Hungarians conuerted by another Adelbert.

From the yeare 1000. vnto the yeare 1100.

Chiefe Pastors.

Ioannes xvii. Ioannes xviii. Sergius iv. Benedictus viii. Ioannes xix. Benedictus ix. Gregorius vi. Clemens ii. Damasus ii. Leo ix. Victor ii. Stephanus x. Nicolaus ii. Alexander ii. Gregorius vii. Victor iii. Vrbanus ii. Paschalis ii.

The Laterane Councell, hauing in it 113. Fathers, vnder Nicolas the second Pope, in which Berengarius the Heretike (who denyed the Reall presence of Christs body in the B. Sacrament) being conuicted, did abjure that Heresy.

Catho-

Catholique Professors.

Odilo Cluniacensis. Henricus II. the Empe-
 your Kunegundis. Colomanus. Petrus Damianus.
 Oddas. Simeon the Eremite. Brado. Dominicus
 Loricatus. Gothardus. Edouardus. Wigbertus.
 Lanfrancus. Gerardus Gandauens. Anselmus.
 Stanislaus. Aswerus. Godfridus Ambianens. Ar-
 nulpheus Sueffon. Iuo. Bruno Carthusian. Hugo
 Cluniacensis. Hugo Grattonopol, and others.

*The Vindicians, and multitudes of Prussians conuer-
 ted in this age.*

From the yeare 1100. vnto the yeare 1200.

Chiefe Pastors.

Gelasius II. Calixtus II. Honorius II. Inno-
 centius II. Celestinus II. Lucius II. Eugenius III.
 Anastasius IV. Adrianus IV. Alexander III. Lucius
 III. Urbanus III. Gregorius VIII. Clemens III.
 Celestinus III. Innocentius III.

*The Lateran Councell, hauing in it 1285. Fathers,
 vnder Pope Innocentius the III. against diuers Heresies.*

Catholique Professors.

Agnes Romana. Noribertus. Malachias. Ber-
 nardus Abb. Gulielmus Duke, and after Eremite.
 Gerardus. Hildegardis. Thomas Cantuariensis.
 Hugo Lincolnienfis, and others.

*The Pomerians and Norwegians conuerred by Ni-
 colas the English Monke, who after was made Pope,
 called Adrian the fourth.*

From

From the yeare 1200. vnto the yeare 1300 ..

Chiefe Pastors.

Honorius **iii.** Gregorius **ix.** Celestinus **iv.**
Innocentius **iv.** Alexander **iv.** Vrbanus **iv.** Cle-
mens **iv.** Gregorius **x.** Innocentius **v.** Adrianus **v.**
Ioannes **xx.** Nicolaus **iii.** Martinus **iv.** Honorius
iv. Nicolaus **iv.** Celestinus **v.** Bonifacius **viii.**

*The Councell of Lyons hauing in it almost 1000. Fa-
thers, vnder Pope Gregory the tenth, against the er-
rour of the Graekes.*

Catholique Professors.

Dominicus Institutor of the Order of Dominican
Fryars. Franciscus Institutor of the Order of the Fran-
ciscan Fryars. Maria de Oegne, Christina Mirabi-
lis, Engelbertus Colonienſis, Petrus Mediolan,
Luitgardis, Elizabeth Lantgraue, Antonius Pa-
duan. Gulielmus Bononienſis, Hyacinthus, Ale-
xander de Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Bonauentura,
Nicolaus Noueſienſis, Hedwigis, Medardes, Ni-
colaus Tolentinus, Irmgardis, Mechtildis, Ger-
trudis, Angela de Fulgineo, and others.

*The Linonians conuerted by Medardes. The Litua-
nians conuerted by the Knights of S. Mary. The Empe-
rour Caſſanes, With innumerable Tartarians conuerted
in this age.*

From the yeare 1300. vnto the yeare 1400.

Chiefe Pastors.

Benedictus ix. Clemens v. Ioannes xxi. Benedictus x. Clemens vi. Innocentius vi. Urbanus v. Gregorius xi. Urbanus vi. Bonifacius ix.

The Councell of Vienna, hauing in it 300. Fathers vnder Pope Clement the first, against diuers Heresies.

Catholique Professors.

Iuo Iurisconsultus, Rochus, Christina Sumlenfis, Venturinus Bergomenfis, Gertrudis ab Oesten, Godfridus Eptingenfis, Henricus Sulo, Catharina Senensis, Albertus Allobrog. Andreas Fesulanus, Gerardus Groet, and others.

Azates Emperour of the Turkes, the Iles of Canaries, the revolted Lituaniens, the Cunians, the Bosnians, the Liphenfians, the Patrinians, and other Sclauonian Nations conuerfed by meanes of Pope Clement the first, and Lewis King of Hungary.

From the yeare 1400. vnto the yeare 1500.

Chiefe Pastors.

Innocentius vii. Gregorius xii. Alexander v. Ioannes xxii. Martinus v. Eugenius iv. Nicolaus v. Calixtus iii. Pius ii. Paulus ii. Sixtus iv. Innocentius viii. Alexander vi.

The Councell of Florence, vnder Pope Eugenius the fourth.

Catho-

Catholique Professors.

Colecta, Vincentius Valentinus, Bernardinus Senensis, Ioannes Capistranus, Laurentius Iustinianus, Antoninus Florentinus, Didacus ab Ascala, Andreas Chias, Maria Toletana, Dominicus Pilcienfis, Margarita Rauenantensis, Nicolaus the Eremite, Iacobus Picenus, Iacobus Alemannus, Columba Reatin, Ioanna Roderigusia, Olanna Mantuanna, and others.

The Gamogotians. The people of the Kingdomes of Betonie, Guinaa, Angola, and Congo conuerst in this age.

From the yeare 1500. vnto the yeare 1600.

Chiefe Pastors.

Pius III. Iulius II. Leo X. Adrianus VI. Clemens VII. Paulus III. Iulius III. Marcellus II. Paulus IV. Pius IV. Pius V. Gregorius XIII. Sixtus V. Urbanus VII. Gregorius XIV. Innocentius IX. Clemens VIII. Leo XI. Paulus V.

The Councellof Trent, vnder Paul the third, and Pius the fourth Popes, against the Lutherans.

Catholique Professors.

Catharina Genuenfis, Franciscus à Paula, Andreas ex Olmo, Franciscus Ximenæus, Gentilis Rauenantensis, Martinus Valentinus, Stephanus Soncinas, Ignatius Loyola Institutor of the Society of Iesus, Franciscus Xauerus, Felix Capucinus, Stanislaus Kostka, Ioannes de S. Francisco, Carolus

Carolus Boromæus, Antonius Pestana, Alexander Capocchius, Nicolaus Fictor, Aloysius Bertrandus, Edmundus Campianus, Philippus Nereus, Antonia Romana, Aloysius Gonzaga, Cæsar Baronius, Gulielmus Alanus, Gregorius de Valentia, Thomas Stapleronus, Robertus Belarminus, Robertus Perlonius, and infinite others.

As in Italie, France, England, Spaine, Germanie, Polonia, and other Christian Countries: besides innumerable people in the Indies, Iaponia, China, Brasilia, and other places lately converted to the Faith, by Religious men of the Roman Faith.

Lo, this is that *Sir Hum.* you are to doe. This is that which is exacted of you. This is the true state of the question, and the Iesuits Challenge. True it is, thorough your extrauagancie, I haue bene forced to foote you, forced to follow you, forced to encountre you, in, and about sundry particular questions, sundry particular controuerfies of Religion, but here I free you, here I exempt you, here I discharge you, here I acquit you of them all, so that you giue vs, so that you produce vs such Catalogue, of visible Protestant Professors in all Ages from Christ to *Luther*. This you are bound to do, this you cannot in conscience refuse to doe, especially sith your selfe confesse; It is an vndoubted truth, and subscribed by both parties, that the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught in the first Age, had visible Professors in all Ages. Especially sith holy Scripture assureth. And he gaue some Apostles, and some Prophets, and ether some Euangelists,
and

and other some Pastors and Doctors &c, vntill we meete
all into the vnitie of faith. Which God of his mer-
cie grant that we may speedily do, Amen.

THe Conclusion, with a discouerie of Sir Hum:
Crooked way, and his fabulous fiction of
being inbreasted in our bosome.

Thus (Sir Humfrey) haue we both seene your
Catalogue of visible Professors, and shewed you
ours. And thus at last are we come to the end of
your *Dangerous, Crooked, and Deceitfull Way*.
Which summarily to discover for such, needes
no other prooffe then a bare and simple repetition
of what you haue said. Behould the man and his
Works, saith holy Scripture: and I; Behould Sir
Hum: and his words; Behould him in a Wood,
behould both him and his Reformed Reader, in
a bushe of Brambles, instead of walking in a
safe Way. Behould him oppugning behould him
writing, behould him fighting with him selfe,
behould him quite over-turning his owne *Via
Tuta*. In the close of my discourse against Master
Preston pag. 131. I haue discovered the defects of
his counterfet Catalogue. You, who proceed not
by Centuries, halfe so honestly as he hath done,
by a cuning deuise, and lesse perceptible to the
simple, faigne a fiction, a meere fable of *Two Si-
sters, Yours and Ours*, with a false pretention of
hauing bene alwayes *inbreasted in our bosome*. But

to discouer your *Deceit*, as I haue done his, and to disinbreast you out of our bosome, I say first.

I.

As a perfect man consisteth of a soule and body, and none can bee a perfect man, without them both : so, the Church of God consisteth of *True doctrine* (which is as it were her soule) and of *lawfull Pastors* and people embracing the same, which make as it were the Churches Body. Now, as it were most absurd to say, that a soule only, without a Body of its owne, were a perfect man : so absurd is it to suppose, that your *Reformed Sister*, with her doctrine (as her soule) existed forsooth, in vs, and that for many ages, without a bodie of her owne. *Out therefore, Sir Hum: of our bosome.*

I I.

According to Philosophie, *Accidents* cannot really subsist, without a *Substance*, nor no created materiall forme, without a *subject* to inhere in. Now, your pretended visible Professors, ether consisted of a reall *Substance*, or they were *Accidents* without a *Substance*. Ether they had *suppositiūms* of their owne to support them, and *distinct* from vs, or they were mixed, they were inuolued, they were inbreasted in our bosome (for, to hange in the emptie aire, without an Organ; they possibly could not.) If mixed, if inuolued, if inbreasted in our bosome, then their faith was a mixed faith. If a mixed faith, (halfe Protestant, halfe Papist) how could it bee a sauing faith, sith the

true sauing faith is but one, as God him selfe is but one? *Out therefore Sir Hum: of our bosome.*

III.

But if with *M. Ioseph Hall* and some others, you will suppose both the present and precedent Church of Rome, for many ages before *Luther*, to haue bene both a true and a false Church, both a true Wife and a Strumpet, both a Berhel and a Babell, both the Temple of God and the Synagogue of Sathan, both a Leaprous and a sound bodie, according to sundrie reasons and respects, yet, that the parts of the comparisons may fully agree, he and you must needs grant, that as there are some men which are leaprous, and yet are men: so are there other some which are vtterly free from that infection (for all man kinde was not leaprous all at once.) And as there are some wiues, which being wiues, yet withall are also strumpets: so are there other some which are honest wiues vnto their husbands, else all married men (and them selues amongst them) are all Cuc-kolds. This supposed, wee demand, wee enquire after those honest Protestant men or women, which neuer abused Christ their holy husbands bed: those entire, sound, and Reformed members, which were neuer infected with our leprosie. If you cannot do this, wee dilband you, wee disinbreast you, saying. *Out Sir Humfrey of our bosome.*

IV.

Should wee admit this blind conceit of your
Reformed

Reformed Protestant Sisters for many ages, being inbreasted in our bosome, this absurdity would ensue: that we only should haue bene the visible Teachers, we the Preachers, wee the Defenders and Propugners (both of your faith and ours, though so different, though so opposit one to another.) We should haue administred, for all those ages, your Sacraments and ours (so contrarie one to another both in number and nature) We should both by calling of Councells, and exercising Ecclesiasticall Censures, defend yours, and defend ours: condemne yours, and condemne ours. What a fancie? What a fiction? What a subiect for some English Poet, to present vpon some twopenny stage? *Out therefore Sir Humfrey of our bosome.*

V.

But to discouer yet further this *Chymera*. Your Reformed Sister, your Reformed faith, hath bene inuolued, hath bene inbreasted in vs for these many ages, ether with our *knowledg*, or without it. To haue bene roosted, to haue bene lodged, to haue bene harboured there so long, *without our knowledg*, is not probable, is not possible. To haue bene lodged there so long *with our knowledg*, we disclaime it, we deny it, we lay with our Sauour. Depart from vs, *ye wicked*, we *know you not*. Yea, your selfetell vs pag. 3. that wee should you for *heretiques, hel bounds of Zuinglius, Luthers Whelpes, Turkish bugenotes, damned persons, and worse then Infidels*. Which supposed, how sensles to ima-

gine, that as such, that with our *knowledg*, wee should inbreast you, wee should lodge you there so long. *Out therefore Sir Hum: of our bosome.*

V I.

You haue bene there so long with our *Wills*, or against our *Wills*. Now, according to vs, man hath freedome, both to good and euill; According to you, freedome to euill only, not to good. We therefore, houlding your Religion to be false, how should we Enstifer you, how should we inbreast you willingly in our bosome? You, houlding your Religion to be good, and denying our freedome of will saue only to euill, we wanting freedome of will to embrace good, how haue we assented, how haue we had the will to inbreast so great a good (and that for so many ages) within our bosome? Grant vs therefore freedome of will, or; *Out Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

V I I.

I disproue this fiction by a reason drawn from a learned Protestant, to wit, from M. Montagu, who in his Answer to the *Gagge*, and Preface to the Reader, saith thus. *If any Papist liuing, or all the Papists liuing can proue vnto me, that the present Roman Church, is ether the Catholique Church, or a sound member of the Catholique Church, I Will subscribe. Again, If any Papist liuing, or all the Papists liuing, can proue vnto me, that the present Church of England, is not a true member of the Catholique Church, I Will subscribe.* Now, if the present Roman Church, be not a sound member of the Catholique Church, how shall

shal the present Church of Englād (being for many ages before *Luther*, alwayes inbreasted in her bosome) be a *sound member* of the Catholike Church? If the present Church of Rome, be not a *true member* of the Catholique Church, how shall the present Church of England (in whom only she was inbreasted) be a *true member* of the Catholique Church? This I wolle, is no great Catholique vntie, in a point of such importance. *Out therefore Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

VIII.

But to heare you speake in your owne words: to tell your pleasant tale of the *Two Sisters*, and your faigned *inbreasting in our bosome*. Pag. 3. You tell vs first, that the present Roman Church, is, *rightly tearmed a malignant Church*. And yet pag. 8. 9. *She still retaynes the Word of God: the twelue Articles of the Apostles Creed, the mayne parts of the Christian truth*. But how is she rightly tearmed a *malignant Church*, who still retaynes the word of God, the twelue Articles of the Apostles Creed, the maine parts of the Christian truth? Or if she still retayne all these, how is she rightly tearmed a *malignant Church*? To quit you with a conceit of your owne, remember what you said pag. 78. *Remove from the bosome of your owne Church all these, and tell me if your Reformed Sister, will not prove a dead and senselesse carcas, and without a soule*. Come in therefore, or else; *Out Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

IX.

Pag. 4. You tell vs next; *It cannot be denied, that*

the now Reformed, and the Ancient Roman Church, are two Sisters. Had you pretended they were, had bene a speech somewhat passable, but to auouch they are, must needes suppose them both in being. Ergo the Ancient Roman Church, still Exists, is still in Esse. But no other Ancient Church Exists but ours. Ergo ours is the Ancient Roman Church. You must still be therfore ether inbreasted in the present Roman Church, or; Out Sir Hum. of our bosome.

X.

Pag. 5. You tell vs next. When it shall be witnessed by her selfe, that her Sister hath kept her first loue, and continued her Ancient birth-right, from the time of the Apostles, to the dayes of Luther. Yet a little before (pag. 4.) you call your Church, the now Reformed. In the first place, you say she kept her ancient birth-right, from the Apostles vnto Luther. If she kept it, then is she not the Reformed Church: for a thing that keepes its first Forme, cannot properly be said to be Reformed. There you were Sister, only with the Ancient Roman Church: here the present Roman Church, is also your Sister. If the present Roman Church be still your Sister. If the Roman Sister, be so kinde to you, as to witnesse in your behalfe, that you haue kept your first loue from Christ to Luther, and that inbreasted in her bosome, how are you then fallen at such defiance with her? Come in therfore altogether, or else, Out Sir Hum. of our bosome.

XI.

Pag. 5. 6. You tell vs sundry examples of Ephraim, of Israel, of Babilon, of Abrahams going out of Chaldea, of the Hebrues departure out of Egypt, *the time of their deliuery being come* (of all which you say; *Such was our departure from the Church of Rome:*) but they all make against your self, which thus I proue. Ether according to Gods expresse commandement, they departed out of those places, or they did not. You can shew the like expresse commandement from God to depart from the Church of Rome, or you can not. You did accordingly depart, or you did not. The time also of your departure, was come long before *Luther*, or it was not. If you had a commandement from God, to depart from the Church of Rome, before *Luther*; If you departed before *Luther*, then shew vs, that expresse commandement you had to depart: then name vs the precise time of your departure. If the time of your departure were come before, if God commanded your departure, who was able to resist the will of God? If God commanded you to depart, and you out of your owne lasinesse, departed not, but lodged there till *Luthers* dayes, how obeyed you Gods commandement? Or if you obeyed Gods commandement, if you went out, how were you lodged there till *Luthers* dayes? Or how was your departure *such*? Euery way the subtile Fox is caught in his owne craft. Euery way the wofull man hath got the Wolfe by the eare. *Out therefore,*

Sir Hum. of our bosome.

XII.

Againe, where you said; *Such is our departure from the Church of Rome*, you further adde, or rather from the errors of that Church, that hath departed from her selfe: and for this cause; *Non fugimus, sed fugamur*, We left her unwillingly, not voluntarily, that we be not partakers of her sinnes, and that we receive not her plagues. Reuel. 18. 4. But ether you are still within her, or you are not. If still within her, then not departed from her. Her errors also, are ether within her, or they are not. If within her for many ages, and you within her for many ages, how departed you from her errors? How were you not partakers of her sinne? How, received you not part of her plagues? If her errors be out of her, then how is she departed from her selfe? Or why are you departed from her? Come in therefore, or else. *Out Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

XIII.

Pag. *ibid.* you tax the Romish Sister, to be Israel playing the harlot, depraved Babilon, Idolatrous Chaldaea, superstitious Egypt, and the like. Yet both with you and *M. Hooker* pag. 8. she is the *beloued of God*, of the familie of *Iesus*, and the like. But if she can be iustly taxed with these haynous crimes, how is she of the familie of *Iesus*, the beloued of God, and the like? Or if of the familie of *Iesus*, if the beloued of God, and the like, how is she culpable of these haynous crimes? *Iesus* what a familie assigne you to *Iesus*? *Out therefore Sir Hum.*
of

of our bosome .

XIV.

Pag. 9. 10. The Church of Rome, both *maintaineth and practiseth, manifest, and manifold Idolatrie; derogateth from the high price of our Redemption; advanceth the Pope for the Lord Paramount above all that are called Gods.* And yet pag. 17 you (with a fallen Friar) inuolue and put Papists and Protestants, all into one Church, and inbreast them both in one bosome . But if she, or they, maintaine manifest and manifold Idolatrie; derogate from the high price of our Redemption, and the like, how make such manifest Idolaters and your selues, all one Church? how feare you not? how fly you not, to inuolue your selfe in such a filthy Churches bosome? If you and manifest Idolaters, were both members of one and the same Church *militant*, how shall you not also be the like, of one and the same Church *Triumphant* . Or, shall manifest and manifold Idolaters, be members of the Church *Triumphant* ? Who euer heard so foolish a fable of so foolish a Friar? *Out therefore Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

XV.

Pag. 4. The Reformed Church of this present time, and the Ancient Roman Church, are *Two Sisters*. Pag. 15. the now Reformed, and the Roman Church of King *Redwalls* time (many hundred yeares since) were still *Two Sisters* . Pag. 7. they were *Sisters* in *Michaell Cecanas* time, many hundred yeares after that. Pag. 12. they were still *Sisters*

Sisters in *George Casanders* time, a man alieue since *Luthers* dayes. Now, if so long *Sisters*, if inbreasted in our bosome till *Luthers* dayes, then ether the *Romish Sister* went not a whoring, plaid not the harlor till *Luthers* dayes (which pag. 5. you charge her with) or else the *Reformed Sister*, retayned fellowship with her lewednes. If she were separate from her, if she retayned not fellowship with her lewednes, then was she not enuolued, then was she not inbreasted in her *Roman Sisters* bosome. Out therefore *Sir Hum.* of our bosome.

XVI.

Pag. 75. Protestant faith and doctrine, was anciently taught, and vniuersally receiued in all ages. Pag. 96. their Church continued visible in the same faith, from *S. Gregorie*, vnto *Luther*. Pag. 97. The Word, and the Sacraments, taught by Christ and his Apostles, were published and proclaimed by Bishops and Archbishops, by Priests, and people. Were visibly knowen, generally published, not in priuat corners, but in publique Libraries; not in obscure assemblies, but in open Churches and generall Congregations. Yet pag. 77. their good Corne was couered with our Chasse; their fine Gould, was ouer-laid with our Drosse; and we sought by a preuayling faction to obscure it. But if their faith and doctrine were vniuersally receiued in all ages; if their Church continued visible in the same faith, from *S. Gregorie* vnto *Luther*, if it were Generally published both by Priests & people, how was their good Corne, couered with our Chasse?

Chasse? How their fine **Gould**, ouer-laid with our **Drosse?** If couered with our **Chasse**, if ouer-laid with our **Drosse**, if obscured by our preuayling faction, how *Ancient?* How *vnuerfall?* How *visible* in all ages? How *Generally* published both by **Priests** and people? Who euer heard so fine a thing, more courfly couered? Or a more triuiall tale, then is tould vs in this *Via Tuta?* *Out therefore Sir Hum. of our bosome.* **XVII.**

Pag. 140. You make vnto vs this demand. *How can the faith of Christians, depend vpon a Church which is fallen from the faith?* And yet both **M. Skynnar**, in his letter of the 20. of August. pag. 171. freely confesseth thus. *But if reason might take place, you may very well perceiue, that the faith and doctrine now professed in the Church of England, was first instituted by Christ and his Apostles; After was taught in your Church, continually vnto this age.* And your selfe, pag. 240. call men and Angels to witnes, that wee our selues haue resolved the grand question (touching your Church before **Luther**) that it was in the bosome of the Ancient Church, long before **Luthers** dayes. Now, if the Church of Rome, may not be depended vpon, because fallen from the faith &c. How was your present Reformed faith taught in her continually vnto this age? If taught in her continually vnto this age, how then fallen from the faith? Surely if reason may take place, you must of fine force confesse, that one of you do giue another a foule fall. *Out therefore Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

XVIII.

Pag. 42. You say thus. *It is foolishnes to Rely vpon the authoritie of the Church of Rome, which is the authoritie of man, and may erre.* And pag. 241. *Your Church is built vpon a more stable and sure foundation, then the now Roman Church.* And yet pag. 72. you say thus. *He therefore that shall question vs, Where our Church was before Luther, let him but looke backe into the bosome of the present Roman Church.* In the one, it is foolishnes to rely vpon the authoritie of our Church; yours is built vpon a more stable and sure foundation. In the other, you are no where built, no where to be found out of our bosome? What foolishnes? What bobing in and out of our bosome? *Out therefore Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

XIX.

Pag. 310. We hauing compassed sea and land, and by imagination ascended into heauen, to seeke for members of our Church, yet our Doctrine of faith which we claime from the primitiue Church, is proued to be but an imaginarie faith: our Martyrs, and Saints, but imaginarie persons, and the heauen which we claime as comon appendant to our Church, a heauen only by Imagination. And yet (as hath bene often proued) your faith was no where out of vs: alwayes innolued, alwayes in-breasted in our bosome: If therefore our faith, be an Imaginary faith: our Saints Imaginary persons, and the like: you hauing had no existance out of vs for a thousand yeares before *Luther*, it must needes follow

follow that your faith is also an Imaginarie faith, your Saints Imaginarie Saints, & your Reformed Sisters heauen, *Sir Hum: head*, only heauē by Imagination. *Out therefore Sir Hum: of our bosome.*

XX.

Pag. 318, you say thus. *Surely it were great pittie, that a charitable opinion on our part, should giue any Romainst occasion, the rather to liue and dye in the bosome of the Roman Church, whereas we should rather giue them a warning in the name of the Apostle. Come out of her my people, that you be not partakers of her plagues.* You giue counsell to others to come out of her bosome, and yet your *Reformed Sister* hath tarried there, these thousand yeares? You will not haue others to liue and dye in her bosome, and yet your selues haue bene lodged there these thousand yeares? To discouer therefore the folly of this fiction, how will you deale with this *Dilemma*? Either you liued there, and dyed there; or liued there, and dyed not there; or dyed there, and liued not there; or nether liued there, nor dyed there. If the first, it maketh for vs. If the second, name vs that other Church distinct from ours, in whose bosome your *Reformed Sister*, yel-ded vp her last breath. If the third, it is dangerous to you, in your owne iudgment. If the fourth, then, *Out Sir Hum: of our bosome.*

XXI.

M. Preston in sundry places, in particular pag. 127. naming sundry notorious papists, concludeth thus. *Here was our Church, and they profess the faith we do.*

We do. You thorough out your whole discourse, haue no other shift, but to suppose you selfe to be our *Sister*, and to hide your heads in our bosome. Yet in the close of this your deceitfull *Safe way* pag. 323. you take God to witnesse, that if you had ten thousand soules, you would not aduenture one of them in the Roman faith, and Roman Church. And pag. 324. your Reuerend *Whitakers*, assure vs, that suruey heauen it selfe, and all the heavenly host, and wee shall not find there one Papist; And Pag. 325. Protestants neuer granted possibilitie of saluation in the bosome of the Roman Church. Lastly, The Cardinalls, Bishops and Schoolmen of the Roman Church, they accompany you part of your way, but they are strangers, and therefore you will Protestants to be wary of them. Now for Gods sake, how glue you this geare together? If you had ten thousands soules, you would not aduenture one of them in the Roman Church, and yet aduenture so many thousand soules (if any such) as liued in the last thousand yeares before *Luther*? nor name, nor can name any Church in the whole world, (distinct from her) to aduenture them in? Againe, Protestants neuer granted a possibilitie of saluation in the bosome of the Roman Church, and yet all Protestants haue beene inbreasted only in her bosome, for a thousand yeares together? Againe, ours accompany you part of your way, but they are strangers to you, and therefore wil yours to be warie of them. But if they were a thousand
yeares

yeares inbreasted in their bosome, how are they strangers to them? How could they possibly bee warie of the, in whose very bosome they were inbreasted? I hope both friends and strangers, wil indeed estrange them selues, and be wary of such a deceitfull way. *Out therefore Sir Hum: of our bosome.*

XXII.

Many Protestants, and your *Sir Hum.* in particular, hould the holie Scripture to be the *sole Rule* of your Religion, and nothing to be beleueed which cannot plainly be proued from thence. But no Protestants, nor *Sir Hum.* in particular, are neuer able to proue plainly from thence, that ether your selues, or your professors haue bene for these thousand yeares inbreasted in our bosome. Ergo this blinde fiction is not all to be beleueed, and *Out you must Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

XXIII.

If you grant that Protestants being inbreasted in the bosome of our corrupt Church, a thousand yeares together, haue beene notwithstanding saued: why may they not bee still saued, as well now, as then, although inbreasted in our bosome? If our Churches corruption were not so great, but that they notwithstanding might be inbreasted, and being inbreasted in ours, might be saued, you must ether proue the corruption of our preient Roman Church, to be greater now, then it euer was in any other age, or else *Out Sir Hum. of our bosome.*

XXIV.

They haue I shewed (according to my poore skill) that for Protestants to deny the perpetuall visibilitie of our Church, is to deny the Sunne to shine at Noone day. To will them to shew, *Where their Church was before Luther*, is, to will them to shew another Sunne and Moone, besides that which hath hitherto shined to all the world. This Demand, is a *Dilemma* to all Protestants. Is that *Gordian Knot*, which neuer Protestant could vntye. Is the fearfull *Lion* which lyes in the way of all Protestants. Is the *burthen* their Churches wombe hath now laboured with these hundred yeares, and yet is still in labour to bee deliuered. Is our *Salomons diuidingf Word*, which clearly discouers, which quite confounds their counterfet Mother. Is that which breakes the very *hart-strings* of them all. No Protestant (like the fearfull *Beare*) can euer be brought to this stake. All Protestants (like the *Owle*) euer fly this light. All Protestants (as truly *Guiltie*) tremble to be tryed at this Barre. If euer they thinke to be at rest: if euer they thinke to close vp this shamefull rift, they must name their *first Apostle*: they must repeat their *visible professors*; they must recite their *succeeding witnesses*; they must proue the *visibilitie & perpetuall* of their Reformed Church; they must produce their *Catalogue*, their *list*, their *Role*, their *Burserie Booke* of names, of that Reformed Sisters issue, which gaue her childre to suck, noo: her the *sincere mylke*; (pag. 4.) which continued her ancient birth-
right

right, from the time of the Apostles, to the dayes
of Luther. (pag. 5.) which would not follow her
defyled Sisters *unknown Wayes*, which went not a
Whoring after her inventions; which can iustifie her
separation, and her not retaining fellowship with her
betwixnes; which let Ephraim alone, being ioyned
to Idols; which sinned not when Israel plaid the
harlot; which in imitation of Abraham, went out
of Chaldaea, because of the Idolatry of the Countrey;
which like vnto the Hebrewes, were led out of E-
gypt by the Moyses and Aarons of their most pure
and vnspotted Synagogue; all which, Sir Hum: are
your owne words, in the first Section, in the first
step, in the first path of your *Via Tuta*, or Safe way.
In a word, this is that golden chaine, this that gol-
den line, which we haue so long looked for. This
that pretious pearle which we haue so long desi-
red to see. This is the glorie of the new Testa-
ment. This the Christians Anchor. This the Rock
against which proud hell gates cannot preuaile.
This the Royall Seate, the eternall Seede of Iesus
Christ. This the *Kingly Priesthood* whereof *S. Paul*
speaketh. This the most profitable, short, and se-
cure question, which can be excogitated to winde
vp all controuersies, Sir Hum: betwixt you and vs.
To this alone you were limited by the Chalège les
you. To this one Proposition. To this one Point
in particular. This said, we shal expect your speedy
Reply, and in the meane space, not cease to pray
for preuenting grace, which God of his goodnes
grant vnto you. Amen.

I am now come (*Sir Hun.*) to the last touch, and last vpsshot of all I am to lay against your *Vista Tuta*. Which is, to tax you, which is to conuince you, of sundry notorious Falsifications and Corruptions of Fathers, Doctors, and Authorities alledged by you selfe in your *safe Way*. I obliged my selfe to shew this, to make this good, to iustifie this to *M. Skinner*. But he flew off, he flinched, as the letters specifie that past betwixt vs. I haue since in this Encounter and skirmish with you, remitted you to a particular place, for the prooffe and triall of this point: the time is now therefore come, for the performance of my promise. You to prevent the worst, to purge your selfe before hande of this imputation, to washe yourself cleane of so odious a crime, labour craftelie like the *Eare-Dig*, to creepe into your too incautelous and over-credulous, Readers eare, by possessing it (I wolle) with a strong and potent protestation, that you *Witnesse a true confession before God and man, that you haue nether wilfully, nor wittingly falsified any one Author, ether in citation, or translation in this Treatise*. If any slips haue hapned &c. you *Will ingeniously confesse the weaknesse, not of your doctrine, but of your owne handling*: Thus you in the last page of your Epistle Dedicatorie, to the Religious and well affected Gentry of the kingdome.

Since my first vndertaking you, and since some of your Protestant friendes haue heard tell of, others seene some of my papers which I had prepared

pared against you; many thinges haue bene said, many thinges bene centured of vs both. Some, vpon what you say protest plainly, neuer to beleeue, neuer to credit so odious a crime, whatsoever I, or any Papist pretend to the contrary; Some, as staggering and doutfull, stand astonished at such proceedings, if by vs they can be proued to be such. Amongst these are *M. Daniel Skinner*, who thus censureth of you, if you haue done this, that *you are a Diuell, and not a man*. Of the same sincere and indifferent strayne, are *M. Goodall*, a very acute and vnderstanding Gentleman of your owne profession, who latelie in the companie of others, in the towne of Dunkerk, hauing heard this crime laid to the charge of *Sir Hum. Lynde*, spared not to say in plaine tearmes (as him selfe told me) *If this be so, We haue all cause to curse him, and to wishe he had neuer bene borne, who so should wrong the common cause*. Another in the same company said. *Gods wounds, and I had him here, I would runne my Rapiar thorough him, were I sure that it were so*. Some of them in your defence laid, touching sundry corruptions laid to your charge of the same kinde, now seauen yeares since, by two particular parties which oppoied you, that perhaps you had neuer seene them to this present, which they supposed was the cause you neuer replied to your Opponents.

These briefly, are the various and sundry Censures that haue bene giuen of vs both, about this businesse. And for mine owne particular, I verely

feare the greatest part by far, will proue such im-
 partiall Iudges on my part, who without any par-
 ticular examination, will exploid me, and per-
 haps put me in their *Pater noster*, but neuer admit
 me in their *Creed*. It was iust the case betwixt M.
Iewell (that egregious Corrupter) and M. *Dottor*
Steuens, sometimes M. *Iewells* right hand and se-
 cond selfe, when he assisted him in the composing
 the *Apologie of the Church of England*; Who per-
 using both his owne, and other mens papers sent
 to further that egregious labour, and discovering
 in them diuers inexcusable & grosse corruptions,
 friendly admonished his Lordship of it, saying.
 My Lord, beware how you insert into your book,
 such and such passages, and authorities, for hauing
 examined and conferrd them with the originalls,
 I finde many of them exceeding false, and assure
 your selfe, the Papists will retort them on you to
 your great disgrace. Content your selfe (good M.
Steuens (quoth the Bishop) we haue three stringes
 to our Bow. The one is, as for the simple people
 & vnlearned, they must belecue vs, whether they
 will or no. For the learned of our side, they will
 take them on trust vpon our Relation, without
 any further examination. And as for the Papists,
 let them say what they wil and write while they
 list, none of ours will euer belecue them: iust mine
 and other Catholiques, disconsolate case. How-
 soeuer, we must not omit to do our endeauours,
 and remit the rest to God, who amongst many,
 may sometimes touch the hart of one alone, as he
 did

did of this great and learned Doctor, converted to the Catholique faith vpon this occasion, as himselfe confessed in Paris to me; where, for his great worth and profound learning, he was Reader of the Hebrue lecture for the King.

Touching those things laid to your charge now seauen yeares since, least it may be so (though very vnlikely) to make all things sure, I will first insert some particulars out of ether of those Authors, & then shal follow those with which I shall touch you concerning your present *Via Tuta*. Whereof yet I will not repeate the twentieth part of those I may, but only here and there some few for breuitie sake; For as our Sauour saith, he that is faithfull in litle, is found also faithfull in much: It was the course that *Mennie the 4. King of France*, tooke betwixt the Bishop of *Eureux*, and *Plessis Mornay* the French Protestant. Who hauing charged him with many hundred corruptions, and verifying publicuely in the Kings presence, only a few (wherof the Protestant partie could not cleare him selfe) his Maiestie concluded, it was enough, and needlesse to examine more; for, *ex vngue Leonem* (as the Proverb saith) *the Lyon is known by his claw*. Come therefore (*Sir Hum.*) for both you and wee must now present our selues vpon the stage, this is the place assigned for publique triall, which must be the touchstone of this truth, whether you haue wittingly and willingly falsified sundry of the same Authors your selfe haue cited yea or no. *Slips* (as you call them) or thinges of lesse

importance, I will let passe, I will vrge none, I will presse none, but those which must needs bewray in you, not only witting, but wilfull malice.

To put forward therefore vnto prooffe, and first to repeate a few out of that booke of *Bertram*, reprinted by your selfe, with a Dedicatorie and long Preface going before it, and charged to be your owne Translation, about which fol. 3. line 21. & fol. 14. line 16. you engage the credit of your Religion, and the surtie of your saluation. The Latin, according to which the Author of the *Plea for the Reall presence* examines your honeltie, is set forth by Protestants in their Booke rearmed, *Catalogus testium veritatis*, anno 1568. apud Iacobum Star, and Iacobum Chouer. The Corruptions you are accused of, are 12. in number, whereof the first is this that followes.

The first place is pag. 4. lin. 19. *That bread which by the Ministry of the Priest is made the Body of Christ, doth shew one thing outwardly to mans senses, and soundeth another thing inwardly to the minde of the faithfull; outwardly indeed the Forme of bread, which Substance it was before, is set out, the colour thereof is shewed, the sauour tasted, but inwardly a thing farre differing is set forth, yea much more pretious and excellent, because diuine, because heauenly, to wit, the body of Christ.* Firtly doth *Bertram* speake in the behalfe of Transubstantiation: and Sir *Humphrey* ashamed to see such papistray in him, seekes by mis-translation to lay a couer ouer it. First, whereas *Bertram* saith, *efficitur*, bread is made, by the power of

of the Priest, the body of Christ, he translates: *becomes the body*. Secondly whereas *Bertram* saith, *Aliud longe pretiosius & excellentius ostenditur*, another more precious and more excellent thing is shewed, he translates, *Is more pretious and excellent shewed*. Thirdly and principally, whereas *Bertram* saith: *Externus quidem panis quod ante fuerat forma, pretenditur*. The forme of bread (which thing or substance befores was) is shewed, he translates, *Outwardly the forme of bread which it had before is shewed*. Most falsely and grossely. First he makes the substantiall verbe *fuerat*, which signifies substantially to be, to suppose, for *habuerat* the accidentall verbe, which signifies the being of things as adiacent vnto substance, not the prime and substantial being. Secondly *quod*, which is heere taken substantiue, and signifies the thing or substance of bread, which quiddity, or essence of bread, *Bertram* saith before consecration was, but after consecration is not. *Sir Humfrey* takes *quod* adiectiue, referring the same vnto *forma*, the forme and shape of bread, to construing the text, *Forma quod ostenditur*, which is such childish and shamefull ignorance, as it is vnworthy to be noted: yet by this ignorance he peruerbs the substance of the Authours meaning.

The second place is pag. 7. lin. 11. *What I pray you, can be more absurd then to take Bread to be flesh, and to affirme Wine to be bloud? And a mystery it cannot be, in which there is no secreet or hidden thing con-
tayned. And how can it be said to be Christs body, in*

Which is not knowne that there is any change made.
 Thus Bertram. Sir Humfrey in the margent noteth,
 that heere Bertram proues, that no change is made
 in the elements of the supper: cleare against the
 drift of Bertram, who by all meanes labours to
 proue, that the bread is changed, not by change
 according to sensible accidents apparantly, but in
 the inward substance inuisibly.

This is proued more cleerly by the third place
 pag. 9. lin. 12. *This change (to wit according to out-
 ward qualities) is not knowne heere to be made; for
 nothing heere can be found to be changed, either in tou-
 ching, or colour, or tast, or sauour. Therefore if nothing
 be changed herein, it is not then any other thing or sub-
 stance, then what it was before, but it is another thing,
 or substance, because bread is made the body of Christ,
 and wine his blood: for so himselfe saith: Take yee and
 eate yee, for this is my body; and speaking of the cup,
 he saith likewise: This is the blood of the new testa-
 ment.* Thus Bertram, cleerly shewing, that the
 Bread is changed substantially, but not to that the
 same outwardly appeare, but is hidden and coue-
 red with the figure and forme of bread.

This is againe made cleere by the fourth place
 pag. 11. lin. 4. *Seeing then this cannot be denied, let
 them tell vs how, and in what respect the elements are
 changed, for corporally nothing is seene to be changed
 in them. Therefore they must of necessity confesse,
 either that they are changed otherwise then accor-
 ding to the body, and so not to be the thing that in ve-
 rity they seeme, but another thing or substance, which
 they*

they are not seene to be according to their owne proper being. Or if they will not confesse this, they are compelled to deny, that they are the body of Christ, which is wicked not only to say, but also to thinke. This place is plaine, and Sir Humfrey doth many wayes by translation obscure it, as the Author of the Plea hath noted in the margent of his Treatise.

The fifth place pag. 22. lin. 5. We are truly persuaded that no faithfull man doubteth, but that bread was made the body of Christ, of which he himselfe giving it to his disciples, saith: This is my body. Sir Humfrey translates quite contrary. For we thinke truly that any faithfull man doubteth whether that Bread becomes Christs body, making Bertram to affirme, that euery man doubts of this change of bread into Christs body.

The sixth, pag. 24. lin. 1. Bertram makes Christ speake in this sort: Doe not thinke you shall corporally eate my flesh deuided into partes, or drinke my blood. Sir Humfrey translates: Thinke not I pray you, that you must either bodily eate my flesh, or bodily drink my blood. So that Bertram his denial of carnal eating, by tearing Christs flesh into peeces, Sir Hū. turnes into a deniall of substantiall eating therof, by reall sumption, whereas the Fathers in this sense say expresly: we take in the Sacrament the flesh of Christ corporally.

The seauenth, pag. 24. lin. 13. Bertram brings Christ saying: Then (after my ascension) the bread and wine turned into the Substance of my body and blood, shall by the mystery, or Sacrament be truly eaten of

of the Faithfull. A place so cleare, that *Sir Humfrey*, like a batt that endures not the light, would beate the same out by mistranslation. For thus it pleaseth him to make *Bertram* speake. *Bread and wine being turned into my body, and bloud, the substance thereof shall in a mystery be receaued.* First he addeth the word *Substance*: bread turned into the substance of Christ's body shall be eaten, saith *Bertram*, bread being turned into the substance of Christs body, the substance of bread shal be eaten, *Sir Humfrey* will haue him say. Is this to translate, and not rather to peruert the meaning of Authors, and make them to speake fondly? For if bread be turned in the substance of Christ body, how can the substance thereof remaine and be eaten. Secondly he leaueth out the word *truly*, saying only it is eaten, whereas *Bertram* saith: it is *truly* eaten, which is a substantial omission in *Bertram*: because *Bertram* in the beginning of his booke, declares that he takes *truly*, to signify the same, as in substance, really, and not only in figure, so that if the body of Christ be *truly* eaten in *Bertrams* opinion, it is eaten in the substance thereof really, and not only in figure.

The eight, *Bertram* saith pag. 27. lin. 13. Was not Christ immolated in himselfe only once, and that about Easter? and yet in the Sacrament not only in all the festiuall dayes of Easter, but also euery day he is sacrificed, or immolated by the people. Thus *Bertram*, which is ranke papistry. Now heare *Sir Humfrey* translating *Bertram* not into English, but into Protestan-

cie.

cie. Was not Christ offered about that time? And yet notwithstanding he is not only every feast of Easter but every day offered vnto the faithfull people. Thus is Bertram trimmed by Sir Humfrey according to the Protestant cut.

The ninth, Bertram saith pag. 30. lin. 8. It is not said, that Christ doth suffer in him selfe every day which he did but once? Sir Hum. to make this place sound against the Masse, or daily oblatiō of Christs body, translates, It is not said that Christ offers himselfe every day, because he did it but once.

The tenth, Bertram saith pag. 41. lin. 6. According to the substance (or corporall Masse) the creatures what they were before, the same they after ward remaine. But they were before bread and wine, according to which forme and shape they are seene still to remaine. Therefore the thing is inwardly changed by the mighty power of the holy Ghost, which change saith be- holdeth. This place is too perspicuous for Transubstantiation, therefore Sir Humfrey in his translation makes a Transubstantiation thereof, changing the very substance of the sense into his owne contrary meaning: Whatsoever they were before consecration they are euen the same after wards, but they were bread and wine before, and therefore they remayne the same, which is proued, because we see that euen when they are consecrated, they remaine in the same kind or forme. Surely Sir Humfrey, this is not to translate Authors out of Latin into English, but to translate fancies out of your owne head into their Treatises. For Bertram was wiser, then to make this foolish

lish argument, which you foyst into his booke; Bread remains in forme and shape, therefore it remains in substance.

The eleuenth, *Bertram* often in this Treatise names the daily celebration of the misteries, signifying the custome of private Masses, or celebrations without communions, which *Sir Humfrey* not enduring, still as well in *Bertram* as in the sentences of other Fathers, translates celebration and administration, by this addition to make *Bertram* a Protestant.

The twelfth and last place pag. 42. is most notoriously corrupted, where for fourty lines together, he translates not one sentence, line, or almost word with correspondence vnto the latin text. I will note only his corruption of one line therof. *Bertram* hath this sentence: *Corpus est Christi quod cernitur, & sanguis qui bibitur; nec querendum quomodo factum sit, sed tenendum quod sic factum sit, What is seene, is Christs body, What is drunke, is his bloud, neither ought we to search the manner how it is done, but beleene that so it is done.* *Sir Humfrey* thus translates: *That is Christs body which is seene, that is bloud which is drunke, and we must not enquire how it is made, or becomes his body, but beleene and hold, and so it is become his body.* Thus he thrusts into *Bertrams* booke his Puritanicall faith. *Crede quod habes & habes:* I now appeale vnto the iudgement of any indifferent Reader to giue sentence, First whether *Sir Humfrey* hath not manifestly corrupted the booke of his *Bertram*? Secondly, whether

ther the booke can be cleare against Transubstantiation, and vtterly overthrow the same, as *Sir Humfrey* boastes, that in so many places maketh so clearely for it. Thirdly, whether it be not the greatest vanity in the world to build a Religio against the Roman Catholicke, and saluation out of their Church, vpon *this tract* which is so papisticall, as *sir Humfrey* his English translation is euen ashamed therof. Finally, whether the Protestants be not in extreme milery and beggary for want of professors and recorders of their Religion before *Luther*, that can finde no better then this Booke, and this Author, whereof they bragge beyond measure.

This much out of the *Plea for the Reall presence*. The next shall be, out of the Booke intituled, *A Defence of the Appendix &c.* By *L. D.* to the Rights Worshipfull *Sir Humfrey Linde*. This Author chargeth you pag. 42. to haue falsly alleadged *S. Cyprian*, against the Reall presence. Pag. 49. to haue falsly alleadged *S. Anstet* against the Reall presence. Pag. 53. to haue falsly alleadged *S. Ambrose* against the Reall presence. Pag. 55. to haue falsly alleadged *S. Ierom* against the Reall presence. And lastly, pag. 58. to haue falsly alleadged *Tertullian* and *Gelasius*, against the Reall presence: all which he proues so amply and at large, that it makes me remit the Reader to the booke it selfe, to auoide the reprinting thereof with needles expence, as I haue done the 12. corruptions out of the *Plea for Reall presence*. These two Bookes being both writ-
ren

ten against your selfe (*Sir Ham*) now seauen yeares since, the first accusing you of so many grosse and wilfull corruptions, and that committed *With excessive audacitie* (pag. 30.) the second, of *fraudulent foisting in, cutting off, and concealing wordes* that follow (pag. 41.) of *stealing from them*, and *smothering the same Authors breath* which your selfe alleadge (pag. 47.) had not your owne conscience accused you as culpable, how seefles is it to imagin that you would haue bene silent all this while? *Slips*, you can not call them: nor no man (of indifferent and candid iudgement) other then *Witting and Wilfull Corruptions*. If you neuer saw them before, sure I am you shall see them now, for *Master Skinnar* by name, hath promised to send you one of the Bookes, although it should cost him fortie shillings to send the same by a post expresse. We shal expect therefore to see how you will purge your selfe of these Aspersions. Next how you will make good your wordes, of *Witnessing a true confession before God and man*, in those wherewith I am to touch you particularly in your *Via Tuta*.

I.

The first, both witing and wilfull corruption wherof I accute you, is, that of pag. 29. where thus you say of D. Harding. *Looke vpon priuat Masses, and of this saith M. Harding, the godly and faithfull people, haue since the time of the primitive Church much complained.*

Suppose them to be the Doctors words; Either

in

in saying so, he said true, or he said false. If false, his testimonie helps you nought at all: nor nought at all hurts vs. If true, then, *privat Masse* having ever beene since the primitive Church, how for Gods sake should the godly and faithfull people complaine of that, wherein the Church hath ever persisted since the primitive times? Or hath any one damnable error endured in the Church since the primitive times?

But to let this escape goe; This Author you have corrupted so egregiously, that I am almost as much ashamed to shew it, as you have cause to be to see it. You cite *D. Harding* saying, that the godly and faithfull people, have since the time of the primitive Church, much complained of *privat Masse*: whereas the contrary is so evident in that learned Doctor, that in the very first Chapter, and very first leafe of all his Booke, he saith expressly thus. *No Masse is privat*, which he repeateth in that only leafe, no lesse then three or foure severall times. Affirming further (to shew his hatred and opposition to the very tearme, in the sence of Protestants) that it *first came from Luther, and the Divels schoole*. Now, what probabilitie, or what apparence, that this learned man should complaine of *Privat Masse*, yet say with all, foure severall times in the same leafe; *No Masse is privat*, and that the very tearme came from *Luther* and the Divells schoole, and which him selfe perhaps had said a thousand times? Again if it came first from *Luthers schoole*, how cōplained of ever since the primitive Church?

Church? Is this you who make so solemne a protestation, *neither wilfully, nor wittingly to haue falsified any one Author, ether in citation, or translation?* Is this (as you boast in the same page) to desire better correspondence with you, in the greatest misterie of your saluation, to tell you, your very hereticall tearme, *came from Luther and the Diuells schoole?* What likelihood that you were inbreasted in this mans bosome, or that this Romish Doctor, should be produced by you, *as a Witnes of Gods truth professed in your Reformed Church?* Epist. Ded. pag. 5. Thus much of your first slip (the roote whereof was of *Luther* and the *Deuills* setting) by the testimony of him in whose bosome you were inbreasted.

I I.

Page 93. You cite a saying out of *D. Vsher* which he taketh out of the woikes of *Abbot Elfrick*, saying thus. *There is a great difference betwixt the body wherein Christ suffered, and the body which is receiued of the faithfull. The body trulie, which Christ suffered in, it was borne of the flesh of Marie, with blood and with bone, with skynne and with sinnewes, in humane limmes, with a reasonable soule liuing: and his spirituall bodie, which nourisheth the faithfull spirituallie* (here both he and you vnconcionably clip off these words; *Secundum speciem quam gerit exterius*, according to the shape which it beareth outwardly) *is gathered of manie cornes, without limme, without soule* (and then you ad these which are not found in your owne Author) *and therefore there is nothing to be vnderstood bodily, but spirituallie.*

Thus

Thus both he and you, most shamefully leaue
 out some words, which should be in, and put in
 some, which should be out, euen as they are found
 and cited by your selues. For where is the Latin
 of these last words; *And therefore there is nothing to
 be vnderstood bodily, but spiritually?* What is corrup-
 tion, what is *Wilsfull* and *Witting* falsification, both
 in *Citation* and *Translation*; if this be not? For put-
 ting these wordes in (*according to the shape it bea-
 reth outwardly*) which you of purpose haue left
 out, the place maketh nothing at all, ether for
 you, nor nothing at all against vs, but greatly for
 vs. For who of vs euer saith, that ether he seeth,
 toucheth, or tasteth outwardly, ether blood or
 bone, lymme, skynne, sinnew; or soule in the B.
 Sacrament? Or that there is not great difference,
 betwixt the body which Christ suffered in vpon
 the Crosse, and those outward Accidents of bread
 and wine? Or how maketh this against the veriti-
 tie of the same bodie, veiled vnder those species
 inuifibly? Where therefore your Author saith. *Hoc
 autem quod in Ecclesia celebratur &c.* But that *which
 is celebrated in the Church, is temporall, not eternall.*
 True, according to the outward shape. *It is cor-
 ruptible, not incorruptible;* True, according to the
 outward shape. *It is dealt into sundry peeces, chewed
 betwene the teeth, and sent into the bellie;* True itill,
 according to the outward shape. Where who is
 so simple as sees not, that both of you had an-
 swered your selues, had you but truly turned into
 Englishe, that which your selues haue in your

owne Latin? And therefore to put in the wordes which you maliciously left out, we may truly say of you and your *Via Tuta*, that, *secundum speciem quam gerit exterius*, according to the shape it beareth outwardly, calling God and man to witnes, neither wilfully, nor wittingly, to falsifie any one Author, either in Citation, or Translation, it may abuse and cosen many an honest & credulous man, as M. Skinner, and the like: but according to the inward truth, it is not able to endure the Touchstone.

In the 68. page of this discourse, your *Via Tuta* further tells vs, in that homilie of Ælfrick, the Papists haue suggested Transubstantiation by two feigned miracles. And that the Latin Epistle Written by Ælfrick to the Archbishop of Torke, is to be seene mangled and razed in a Manuscript in Benets Colledge in Cambridge. A strange tale, truly, of your owne telling; For first by these words you plainly discredit the Story your selfe produce: which by your owne confession, proueth Transubstantiation by two seuerall miracles. Next, that the Epistle is to be seene mangled and razed in a Manuscript in Cambridge. Where I do not much maruell, how you deale to with that ould Author, whom your selues keeps vnder lock and key, when as you dare corrupt him thus, euen there where your selues to publique view, set him truly downe in Latin, and yet translate him falsly into English.

III.

Your Third wilfull and witting Corruption, is
com-

committed in citing *Bellarmino*, against the merit
of good workes pag. 269. Whereat I maruell so
much the more, because this very obiection hath
bene before beaten back into the faces of prime
Protestants, as of D. *White* by name, whereof I
know not how so great a scholler as *Sir Hamfrey*
is reputed, can be ignorant; I will here therefore
repeate the obiection, and then set downe the re-
sutation word by word, as I finde it in the Trea-
tise intituled, *White, dyed Black*, pag. 13. and let
the world iudge, if you had not your Answer
long before. His words are these.

Now in prooffe that the Catholicke Doctors
condemne all merite of workes, he alleadgeth a-
mong others the foresaid Cardinall thus writing.
*By reason of the vncertainty of mans owne righteous-
nes, and for feare of vaine glory, it is the safest way
to repose our whole confidence in the sole mercy and
goodnes of God.* But why thinke you stayeth the
man in that place and passeth no further? You shall
knowe, for the immediate wordes following in
Bellarmino are these. *Explico propositionem. Non
enim ita accipienda est &c.* I explaine this proposi-
tion (meaning his former sentence) which is not
so to be taken as that a man should not labour
with all his endeouour to doe good workes, and
that there were no trust to be put in them, or as
if they were not be accompted as true iustice, or
could not endure the iudgement of God: but only
this we say, that it is more safe to forgette after a
sort our good workes, and to cast our eye vpon

„ the sole mercy of God. Thus we see how gree-
 „ dily our minister takes hould of the text, and yet
 „ concealeth the comment though given by the Au-
 „ thor him selfe. And therefore I appeale to the cen-
 „ sure of the iudicious if the whole contexture of
 „ this testimony, which is vrged for the ouerthrow-
 „ ing of merites, doth not euen depose the contra-
 „ rie, in positively confirming and maintaining the
 „ doctrine of merites. Againe what impudency is it
 „ in *M. White* to produce Bellarmine as denying the
 „ doctrine of workes, when as the subiect of this
 „ very booke (from whence the former wordes are
 „ taken, as also of diuers other bookes in that tome)
 „ is onely to proue that workes do merite. Had you
 your answer herein long agoe, yea, or no? If you
 had, what a shame is it, so to toyle vs, so to force
 vs to beate back one and the same thing, so often
 times into your faces?

IIII.

The Fourth both wilfull and witting Corrup-
 tion wherewith I accule you, is committed in
 the words of the blessed Martyr Bishop *Fisher*, pag.
 107. and cited by you against the truth of Tran-
 substantiation, and Christs reall presence in the
 Sacrifice of the Masse. His wordes are these, cap.
 10. pag. 167. printed at Paris by William Des-
 boys anno 1562. *Hactenus Matheus, qui & solus Te-*
stamenti noui meminit. Neque vllum hic verbum pos-
tum est, quo probetur in nostra Missa, veram fieri carnem
& sanguinis Christi praesentiam. Nam etsi Christus ex
pane carnem suam, & ex vino sanguinem effecerit, non

ob id consequitur, virtute alicuius verbi hic positi, *nor*
quoties id ipsum tentauerimus, idem effecturos &c. And
 pag. 168. *Non potest igitur per vllam scripturam pro-*
bati, quod aut Laicus, aut Sacerdos, quoties id nego-
ti tentauerit, pari modo conficiet ex pane vinoque Chri-
sti corpus & sanguinem, atque Christus ipse conficit,
quum nec istud in scripturis contineatur. This place
 you translate thus. *Hitherto S. Mathew, who only*
maketh mention of the new Testament, neither are there
any wordes here written, whereby it may be proued,
that in the Masse is made the very presence of the bodie
and blood of Christ. And lastly he concludeth. *It*
cannot be proued by any Scripture.

The wordes and meaning of this Bishop, you
 have abused notoriously, partly by delumbating
 and leauing out, partly by falsifying the Transla-
 tion: which to make plainly appeare, thus I proue.
 Two thinges in that Chapter, are disputed by that
 learned Bishop against *Luther*. The one (and that
 the chiefe) touching *Tradition*: prouing, that the
 vnderstanding of the gospell, is to be had more
 certainly from the interpretation of the Fathers,
 and custome come from them to vs, then from
 the naked wordes them selues, which *Luther* it
 seemeth did deny. The other (which the same
 man peeuisly maintained) that the *Masse* was a
Promise, and, that Priests (yea and lay-men) now
 at this present, had power in this case, to doe that
 which Christ and his Apostles did; which first the
 Bishop denyeth can be so expresly proued out of
 Scripture, that a refractary man, may be forced to

Yeld vnto the truth, without the helpe of Tradition; and as for the second, I thinke your selues will not maintaine it.

This premised, & to make plainly appeare your Corruption. First, in your sense, you make the Bishop say, that *there are no words in Scripture, whereby may be proued, that in the Masse is made the very presence of the body & blood of Christ; It cannot be proued by any scripture.* (pag. 107.) But the Bishop saith not absolutely, that there are no wordes in any scripture to proue the same, but that there are none in *S. Mathew*; for though they be not in that Euangelist, yet may they be in another, many particulars being in one of them, which are not in the other; which made him to say. *Virtute alicuius verbi hic positi*: and a litle before (most warily thus.) *Quod cum certitudo non tam habeatur ex verbis Euangelij, quam ex patrum interpretatione*: which is not absolutely to deny, that there is no scripture at all to proue the same.

Secondly, euen there where he saith; *It cannot be proued by any Scripture*: he denyeth not, that it can be proued by any Scripture, that in the Masse is made the very presence of the body and blood of Christ (as you most deceitfully would hate your Reader to surmise:) what then is that which he telleth Luther cannot be proued by any Scripture? Forsooth, that Christ promised to his Apostles and their successors, cleargy or lay men, power to doe that which himselfe did in that misterious supper, neither this also absolutely, but *apud eum* (scilicet

Luthe-

*Lutherum) qui nihil preter scripturas admittit: Vix. in
Luthers opiniō who admits nothing but scripture.
This is it wherof he saith. Non potest per vllam
scripturam probari. It cannot be proued by any
scripture, and which for very shame you concea-
led; And can you proue vs this by any kinde of
expresse scripture?*

*Thirdly, where the Bishop saith. Nether is there
any wordes here written, whereby it may be proued,
that in OVR Masse is made the verie presence of the bo-
die and blood of Christ. You wilfully and wittingly,
yea molt maliciously, leaue out the word Nostra,
OVR Masse, it being the principall thing that
learned man labourerth there to proue against Lu-
ther, and which he presseth against him in sundry
places; For example pag. 166. Nemo propabit &c.
No man shall proue, from the bare wordes of the
gospell, any priest in these times, to consecrate the
true flesh and blood of Christ: not that this
thing is now doutfull &c. And pag. ibid. If one
should graunt, Christ in the supper to haue made
truly of bread and wine; his body and blood, yet
it is not inferd from hence, that euery priest doth
the like: the which he repeateth in sundry other
places. And then tollowerth pag. 167. Nether are
there any wordes here written, whereby it may be proued
that in OVR Masse, is made the verie presence of the
bodie and blood of Christ.*

*This, I say, is the principall thing that learned
man labourerth to proue against Luther, that al-
though granted, that Christ himselfe and his Apo-*

stles, made of bread and wine his body and blood in their Masse, yet (abstracting from the iudgment of the Church, and Tradition from them to vs) it cannot be proued by expresse scripture, that their Successors and other Pastors NOW in their present Masses, haue ether the Power or Promise, to do the same, that Christ and his Apostles did. *Non potest per vllam scripturam probari.* It cannot be proued by any scripture.

This said, who sees not here, both your wilfull, and witting Corruption? For to say that no words are to be found in scripture which proue the body of Christ to be in OVR Masse, may be said to exclude only those that consecrate at this present: But to speake as you do, excludes also euen Christ him selfe, and his Apostles to haue effected the same in their Consecration. Contrary wherto Luther him selfe freely confelleth, that Christ both instituted, and celebrated the first Masse, as hath bene proued pag. 45. against M. Preston. And who so simple as sees not this euident difference? The foole, who saith in his hart there is no God, will not say OVR Father, yet the same foole will neuer stick to say the Father, meaning in the sence of other men who acknowledged this, not in his owne, who absolutely denyeth it.

Thus by your leauing out this one word OVR Masse, you haue abused this B. Bishop, most vnchristianly corrupted the whole discourse, and the state of the question, so to make your simple Reader quite mistake your Authors meaning. For

were the dispute, not about OVR Masse, but about Your English Supper, or the French Cene, may not your selues say the same this blessed Bishop did? Hitherto *S. Mathew*, who only maketh mention of the new Testament: nether is there any word here written, wherby it may be proued, that ether in OVR Frésh or English Supper, is done that which Christ did. *Non potest per vllam scripturam probari*. It cannot be proued by any scripture. Lo what wronge you doe vs, and what trouble you put vs to, by your wilfull and malicious leauing out of one only word, lopping off, aboue three-score lines, and then coupling and knitting the dilcourse together, so the better to shadow your deceit.

V.

The Fift, both *Wilfull* and *Witting* Corruption, is committed about *Theodoret* pag. 113. Whose wordes being, *Mystica signa*, you translate them thus; *The consecrated Elements*: where nether of both, being truly turned, signify a thing consecrated: nor are all *mysticall signes*, consecrated things in that sence which both of vs vnderstand the Sacramentall signes to be. It is indeed, to your great aduantage, to translate so: for then *Theodoret* should say, that the elements, or substances of bread and wine, after consecration remaine in the same nature, substance, force, and figure, which they had before: but *Theodoret* sayes no such thinge, who vseth warily the word of *Symbols*, or *Signes*, which are the accidents or shewes of bread and wine, of which

which it is most true, that even after consecration, they remaine in the same substance or essence, in the same nature forme, and figure &c. because, though the elements of bread and wine remaine not, but are transubstantiated into the body of Christ, yet the accidents of bread and wine, retain their ancient essence, nature, forme, and figure.

But let this passe vnder the title of a slip, you haue besides lamed, mangled and delumbated this Auncient Father most lamentably; for after the wordes cited by you, these do follow which quite overthrow your single-sole Supper. *Es videri, & tangi possunt, sicut prius.* And they may be seene, and be touched as before: which plainly import, somewhat to be couched, somewhat to be contrayned vnder those consecrated elements (as you call them) which was not before Consecration; As alio; those others doe. *Intelliguntur autem ea esse quae facta sunt & creduntur, & adorantur, ut quae illa sunt quae creduntur.* And they are vnderstood to be those things which they are made, and are beleueed; and are adored, as being those things which they are beleueed to be. All which words most vnconscionably cut off by you, quite spill, and quite marre all your marker. For what, I pray, is there made, what is there beleueed, and beeing beleueed, is alio adored, vnder themysticall signes, or consecrated elements of your English Supper?

V I.

Your, Sixt wilfull, and witting Corruption is
com-

committed pag. 126. in citing of *Cochleus*, against the practise of Priuat Masse, as you please to phrase it, and to proue that anciently, *all the Priests and people, did communicate together.*

That many Priests and people, did so communicate, we deny not: that none did communicate priuatly, or by them selues alone, this we deny. But to come to the discouery of your Corruption. To make this Author speake as you would haue him, you abuse him diuersly 1. Two senerall times you adde the word *together*, not once in the Latin in your owne margent: it being the principall thing, and wherein the whole force consists of what you vndertake to proue. 2. Where the Latin saith, that this was caused, *by the negligence of the Priests and people*, you turne the same in English thus. *By the negligence of the Priests and Pastors*: so to lay all the fault vpon the Priests and Pastors, and none at all vpon the people; Iust as you dealt a litle before with Doctor *Harding*: he saith that the godlie and carefull Rulers of the people haue since the time of the primitiue Church, much complained of the negligence of the people, and you make him to say that they complained of priuat Masse: so that according to this account, the very negligence of the people, is priuat Masse. Appale you not at such proceedings. 3. The fault which is here laid vpon the priests, is not for celebrating without communicants, but for not communicating at the Masse which they heard together with the people, when them selues did not cele-

celebrate. 4. Where the Latin saith. *The holy Ghost hath found and introduced a pious supply of this negligence, by frequenting of Masses, which only the Priests celebrate*: you leaue out quite the word *frequenting* (as though the Priests said Masse alone, or priuately) and instead of these other wordes, *which only the Priests celebrate*, you haue patched too these words of your owne, *in celebrating priuat Masse*. If this be to witnes a true confession before God and man, then am I truly out of my wits; or what is notorious impudencie and audacitie, if this be not, to cite an Author truly in Latin in your owne margent, after to falsifie and corrupt him in your English translation, and yet to cry out, that you witnes a true confession before God and man, and nether falsifie in Citation nor Translation?

VII.

The *Seauenth* is that of *Alexander de Hales* pag. 146. of whom you say thus. Accursed be *Alexander ab Hales*, for he saith there are only four, which are in any sort properly to be said Sacraments of the new law.

This Author you wrong as wilfully and as *wit-singly* as the former, affirming him to say there are *only four*; who in the place cited by your selfe, denyeth not one of the seauen to be proper Sacraments, but doth in generall acknowledge them all: much lesse doth he say as you would haue him, that the other three are *supposed Sacraments*, and, *had their being before*; for where finde you that
in

in *Hales*? But if you did, euen for this doctrine alone he is *de facto* disinbreasted out of our bosome; If disinbreasted out of ours, and held for an heretique by vs, how are you inbreasted in our bosome? Or how inbreast you your selfe in the bosome of an Heretique, confessing four proper Sacraments, and you but two?

V I I I.

The Eight is, that of *Durandus*, pag. 147. of whom you say as you said of *Hales*. Accursed be *Durand*, for he alloweth but Six proper Sacraments, for *Matrimonie* (saith he) is not a Sacrament, strictly and properly so called, as other Sacraments are,

This Author you wrong as wilfully as you do the former; For *Durandus* in the same place cited by your selfe, saith thus in expresse tearmes. *Tenendum est absolute, quod matrimonium est Sacramentum*. Matrimonie is to be held for a Sacrament absolutely, & that the contrary is heretical. Now, how should he say in one and the same place, that matrimonie is not a Sacrament properly so called, and yet with all, that it is to be held for a Sacrament absolutely?

Secondly, those wordes are not *Durands* assertion, as though in his iudgement it were not properly a Sacrament, but they are the conclusion of an Answer to a Logickall obiection, which in these his words he saith, although it should proue *permissively*, that marriage were not strictly a Sacrament; yet not, that it is not absolutely a Sacrament,

ment. Or say he did, what a buzze were this, that
 ether he should be one of ours, or you inbreasted
 in his bosome? You spoile your selfe, you vtterly
 vndoe your selfe, by citing such Doctors; For ether
 this mans doctrine was the doctrine of the Church
 of God, or the doctrine of the deuill. If the first,
 then you confessing but two Sacraments, and the
 Church of God six, how are you conioyned with
 the Church of God? If the second, how inbreast
 you your selfe in the deuills bosome?

IX.

Besides the Corruptions of *Eusebius*, the Coun-
 cell of *Eliberis* in Spaine, and that of *Valens* and
Theodosius Emperors, wherewith pag. 505. I haue
 charged you (and shall long to see how well you
 will discharge your selfe) I had almost forgot (but
 may not omit) to charge you with the notable
 wrong you doe *S. Austen* pag. 52. citing his words
 after one sort in your owne margent, and turning
 them thus after another into English. *I my selfe*
know many, that are worshippers of tombes and pi-
ctures, whom the Church condemneth, and seekes
euery day by correction to amend them as vngracious
children. Aug. de moribus Ecclesiæ cap. 34. And
 then the pag following you say; That which was
 then condemned by *S. Austen* and the Church for
 superstition, was confirmed four hundred yeares
 after by the second Councell of Nice, for Catho-
 lique doctrine, and is now decreed by the Coun-
 cell of Trent for an Article of faith; thus you.

First, where your selfe haue in your margent
 in

in the Latin, these expresse words. *Nunc vos illud
admoneo vt Cathol. Eccles. maledicere desinatis, vni-
perando mores hominum*: all this you haue quite o-
mitted in your English, by which *S. Austen* admo-
nisheth, that none should speake ill of the Church,
for the euill manners of some of her particular
members, shewing that the Church neuer appro-
ued that abuse which then himselfe and she, com-
plained of: this you thought good to curtail, so to
make the world beleue that *this corruption*, wher-
of Protestants complaine at this present, was
crept into the Church in *S. Austens* time, which
he denies in flat tearmes, saying. *I warne you to
cease to speake ill of the Catholique Church, dispraising
the maners of men, whom she condemnes*: by what
law did you lop of this?

2. (Which is far more insupportable then the
former) after you haue cropt and lopt off part of
his words at your pleasure, you thus glosse vpon
the rest which you haue left standing: that, *what
was condemned by the Church of his time, was confir-
med four hundred yeares after by the Councell of Nice
for Catholique doctrine*; so making the Church re-
presentatiue of that time, opposite to that of *S. Au-
stens*. Now as we know what Tombes & Image-
worship you condemne in vs, & in the holy Coun-
cell of *Nice* so long since, so to discouer the egre-
gious wrong you do *S. Austen*, we are to examine,
whether the abuse, the corruption, and supersti-
tion he complained of then, be the same you ac-
cuse those two holy Councils of, and vs, yea, or
no.

no. To discover this, I will haue recourse to the *Answer to the Nine points* exhibited to his Maiesties Father of worthy memorie, which your selfe confesse to haue seene, as I haue proued against you in this Treatise. Wherin is manifestly conuinc'd against M. White, pag. 153. the euident wrong both you and he, doe *S. Austen*. For there the Author sheweth, to his and your eternall shame, that the error which that learned Father complained off, was, *of some Christians in those dayes, who being newly conuerted from Paganisme, and so retayning some reliques thereof, did out of their affection to their deceased friends and parents, vs. to paint their Images, and offer vnto them oblations of Frankincense, and other the like heathenish honor, especially in their Annisuarie dayes vpon their sepulchres.*

These were the men of whom *S. Austen* vnder the title of worshippers of Tombs and Pictures reprehends, offering that heathenish worship to the Ghosts of their deceased parents (de mor. Eccles. cap. 36) can you charge vs, can you accuse vs to do this? How then can you with any conscience say as you doe, *We are all eye witnesses, that this Corruption hath got the vpper hand, and that which was then condemned by S. Austen and the Church for superstition, was confirmed four hundred yeares after by the second Councell of Nice for Catholique doctrine, and is now decreed by the Councell of Trent for an Article of faith?* If this be not both wilfully and dishonestly to falsifie the Authors which you alleadge,

If this be not to smother their breaths, and to turne their necks quite about, let God and men, to whom you appeale, iudge betwixt you and vs; and shame to insult to ouer vs, fastnig on vs such manifest falsehoods.

XI.

But it is no maruell you dare deale thus with ancient Fathers, and moderne Doctors, when you spare not sacred Scripture it selfe, wherof behould a few examples, that so euery one, boy or girle, that can but reade your English Bible, may be able to conuince you. Pag. 9. 10. you cite S. Paul (Rom. 11. 28. saying thus. And that which S. Paul witnessed of the Israelites, that in *one respect they were enemies, but in another they were beloued of God*: so likewise as concerning the word of God, and the Apostles Creed, we giue the Church of Rome her due; but in another respect as she hath created twelue new Articles, and coyned new expositions vpon theould &c. In these and many like respects, we say her Tenure is meane and base, &c. and she a professed enimie to the gospell: thus you.

To discouer how vnchristianlie you haue corrupted this place of Scripture, I will lay downe the reading, first of your owne Bible, and then of ours. Your owne readeth thus. *As concerning the gospell, they are enemies for your sake but as touching the election, they are beloued for the Fathers sake, for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.* Thus your owne Bible of anno 1615. Our Rhemes

Translation, readeth thus. *According to the gospell indeed, enemies for you: but according to the election, most deare for the Fathers, for without repentance are the gifts and the vocation of God.* Where the difference is litle betwixt your reading and ours, but great betwixt ether of them, and your *Via Tuta*, not following litterally, but notoriously corrupting, both the wordes them selues, and the very sence of the holy Ghost: nether following our Translation, nor your owne, and yet putting the same in a distinct letter, as if it were the word of God: and which, had you alleadged truly as it lyeth, proues the quite contrary of what you pretend, as I shall plainly make appeare.

You suppose (or should suppose, if your comparison be to purpose) two respects to be in the Iewes; one for which they were beloued of the Father, another for which they were hated of him. In like maner, two respects to be in the Church of Rome, one, for which she is to be loued; another for which she is to be hated. Now the scripture putteth one only respect in the Iewes, and not two: one in them, the other in God, to wit, their *election*, which was not in them, but an act in God, and out of them as the verse following doth plainly declare. See then how this place is abused by you? The word was that, for which the Iewes are reputed enemies; the word is that for which the Church of Rome is reputed to be *of the familie of Iesus*. The Iewes are the beloued of the Father, as touching the election; the Church
of

of Rome is so also, as touching the election, because the gifts of God are without repentance, as well to her, as to the Iewes. How is this place then applyed against the Church of Rome? How is not this to deprave, to abuse scripture notoriously? Yea, how proues not this the quite contrarie of what you pretend, that very respect mentioned by the Apostle, for which the people of the Iewes were hated, being found in the Church of Rome, by your owne confession?

XII.

Pag. 123. you cite a passage of *S. Paul. 1. Cor. 11. 20.* against *prius Masse*. The wordes them selues; you thus lay downe. *When you come together (to eate the Lords supper) tarry one for another, that you come not together vnto condemnation.*

This place of Scripture (as the former) you haue depraved notoriously, both in the sence, and the words them selues, as I haue shewed before pag. 383. for that they are ment of the Corinthiâs feasts of Charitie, not of our Lords supper, or Sacramentall Communion. Which the better to discover, behold how your owne allowed Bible readeth to vs. *When yee come together to eate, tarry one for another. And if any man hungar, let him eate at home, that you come not together vnto condemnation.* Where what childe discernes not, what a world of violence you haue offered to the text? First, by adding after the words, *come together to eate*, these three words out of your owne head, neuer an one wherof are in holy scripture [*the Lords supper.*] Secondly,

condly, putting them in the selfe same Character, together with the holy scripture, by which every Reader ordinarily doth distinguish the one, from the other. Thirdly, by cutting off this whole sentence [*And if any man hungre, let him eat at home*] and then knitting the former clause with the later, as though nothing at all went betwixt. How dare you deale thus with the word of God? What is notorious audacitie, if this be not? What is *Willfull* and *Witting* falsification if this be not? For these words which you have left out [*If any man hungre, let him eat at home*] do plainly shew, that the Apostle spake, not of the Lords supper, but of other common meate; according to the opinion of many learned interpreters. Yea, suppose but otherwise, and you quite overthrow all you have spoke against privat Masse: for if they be to be vnderstood of the Lords supper, then the Apostle vsing these expresse words [*any man, and, at home*] one man may receiue alone, and privatly in his owne house, by the warrant and permission of the Apostle: which quite ouerthrowes all you pretend against privat Masse.

XIII.

Your *Thirteene* both *Willfull* and *Witting* Corruption, and that so euident as cannot be couered with any excuse, is that of pag. 315. committed about the wordes of the Prophet *Isay* cap. 28. *11.* not cap. 23. *11.* as you as assigne vs. Where you haue contrary to your owne Bible, left out some words, and substituted others in their place, setting
the

the Cart before the horse: turned some singular into plurall: added no lesse then seauen or eight, not one of which are in scripture: curtaild and left out no lesse then twentie, euery one of which are in your owne Bible. All which, pag. 656. &c. in this my Answer, is to be seene at large, with all the particulars, wherto for breuity, I remit you

Thus hauing giuen you a Bakers dosen for an instance, what maruell that the Author of the *Plea for the Reall presence*, accuseth you to haue translated, *twelue seuerall places falsly* in the booke of *Bertram*, and that *with excessiue audacitie*? pag. 30. *That ashamed to see such Papiſtrie in him*, you lecke by *misſtranslation*, to lay a cleanly couer ouer it pag. 31. Of your turning wordes, *most falsly and grossly* *ibid.* Of your most *childish and shamefull ignorance* in construction. Comparing you to a *Bass*, that not endering the light, would mend the lame by *misſtranslation*. pag. 35. Taxing you for *trimming of Bertram*, according to the *Protestant* cur. pag. 36. Adding, that *this is not to translate Authors out of Latin into English, but to translate fancies out of your owne head, into their Treatises.* pag. 37. That the last of the *Twelue Corruptions* whereof he accuseth you, is so *notoriously corrupted* by you, that *fortis lines together*. you *translate not one sentence, line, or almost word, with correspondence vnto the Latin text.* pag. 38. What maruell, that the Author of the *Appendix*, chargeth you (pag. 41.) with *fraudulent ſoyſting in of words of yours into S. Austen*, to cut off and conceale the wordes that follow? Of *fraudulency*

concealing wordes of Bellarmine. pag. 45. Of foule fraud, and grossly appearing, in citing of S. Cyprian. pag. ibid. Of stealing, and smothering your Authors breath. pag. 47. Yet againe, that you haue egregiously abused S. Austen, and plainly perverted his meaning. pag. 52. That you haue wrested S. Ambrose his words against his meaning. pag. 55. with more the like which he layeth to your charge, about S. Ierom and Gelasius.

What haue you said for your selfe in these seauen yeares space, for all the crymes of this kind, wherwith these two seuerall Authors haue accused you? What Apologie, what particular worke haue you published to purge your selfe? What a prettie peece of policie call you this, to accuse other men, *by shifts and caulls to turne the necks of Scriptures and Fathers cleane about so to wrest them to their owne side* (pag. 42.) and your selfe to be, not only accused, but evidently conuincied culpable in the highest degree? To call God and man to witnesse, that you haue *neither wilfully nor wiltingly falsified any Author, ether in Citation, or Translation*, and yet to performe the same so palpably, sometimes by leauing out whole and many pages together, sometimes halfe pages, sometimes whole sentences, sometimes inserting wordes of your owne, sometimes lopping off what liked you not, and this not only in Ancient Fathers, Ancient Councels, and moderne Doctores, but euen in sacred Scripture it selfe, and that so sensibly as by no wit of man can be concealed, according as you
thought

thought requisite for the bettering of your cause, and disgracing ours, and then to cry out, that you condescend to meete the aduersarie vpon his owne ground, and to deale with him at the same weapons which him selfe hath chosen? That you will conuince him out of his owne Romish Bishops, Doctors, Cardinalls, and Schoole men? What is all this, but as if some braging Thraße, being to combat, should at the time they should couple and encounter, cause his enimie to be clapt in prison, and then shew his chiuallry vpon a man of clouts? or instead of a body, only fight with his owne fancies, or an emptie shadow? What I, say is all this, but to fill the ayre with emptie smoke? To cast dust and sand into the beholders eyes, that they may not discouer your deceit? Corruptions of *mistaking*, may be excused, ether in you, in me, or in any man else, but those of manifest and wilfull malice, by no meanes possiblie. I shall expect therefore, and so I hope will the sincere Reader to, how you acquit your selfe of these accusations, hoping that hereafter he will giue credit to you, and your *citations*, by waight and measure, looking to your fingars, as well as to your lips, as those vse to doe who deale with Egipcians.

Meane while, for mine owne defence, all whatsoever is by me published in this present Treatise, I do with all true Meeknes, humble Resignation and Subiection, lay my selfe and it, at the feete of our Reuerend, and learned Cleargie, protesting vnfeynedly, not to haue bene drawen

hereto, either vpon pride, or any desire to be meddling and dealing in these sacred matters, but only, and purely to preserve the soules of some particular friends, of whom I had great hope of their recovery. Which therefore if they shall please to approve, I shall iudge my selfe more then abundantly repaid. If they shall improne, or ought therein, hauing notice therof, I my selfe promise to be the first that shall take pen in hand, to oppose it, to write against it, and, as an obedient childe of holy Church ought to do, francklie and freelie to recall it. And as for you *Sir Hum.* who boast the Ancient Fathers to be all for you, and claime the glorious Saints of the Catholique Church, as Patrons of your present Protestantisme, I hope I haue made it manifest, in this my Answer, that betwixt the Saints in glorie, and you plunged here in the pit of heresie, *there is fixed a great Chaos* (Mat. 16. 26.) so as with so slender a passport to passe the Way, nether can they passe from thence to you, nor can you passe from hence to them: yea rather let the impartiall Reader iudge, by that which ether party hath said for himselfe, whether you be not in extreame miserie and beggarie, for want of professors & recorders of your Religion before *Lutber*, that can finde no better proofes, then such corrupted and mangled testimonies, as you haue brought against vs in your *Via Tuta*, for as for your true translations and citations, and which are any thing to purpose, they may for their quantitie, be all engrauen within a ring, whereas your wilfull
and

and witting deprauations, do stretch beyond all reasonable dimension. Whence I conclude in your owne words cited out of the glorious *S. Ambrose*, in answer to the wicked *Arrians*. (pag. 99.) *They may well blot out our letters, but our faith they shall neuer abolish.* Ambros. rat. 1. cont. Arrian.

*The Conclusion, containing a Catholique
Via Tuta.*

I Had once thought to haue ended here, but ha-
uing traced our *Knights Errant* thoroughout his
Via Tuta, and discovered the *Danger*, Crookednes,
and vncertaintie of his *Safe Way*, I will here for
the better addresse of each doubtful passenger brief-
lie present him a *Safe*, easie, plaine, and perspi-
cuous *Way* of our prescribing: Let him be but one
of indifferent and common capacitie, and I am
content to stand to his iudgement, whether of the
two (that of Protestants, or this of Papists) be the
best for him to follow.

The life of man here in earth, is rearmed in holy
Scripture, by two seuerall distinct, and particular
names, *A Pilgrimage*, and, *A Warfare*. *A Pilgrimage*,
in respect of his tending towards his true contrie
of heauen; *A Warfare*, in respect of the manifold
enimies that assault and set vpon him in his iorney
thither. The one is gathered out of these words
of holie Scripture (Heb. 13. 14.) *For we haue not
here a permanent citie, but we seeke that which is to
come.* And 2. Cor. 5. 6. *While we are in this body,*
we

We are Pilgrimes from God . The other from these, Job. 7. The life of man, is a Warfare vpon earth. And 1. Pet. 2. 11. I beseech you as strangers and Pilgrimes, so reſtaine your ſelues from carnal deſires, which warre againſt the ſoule: where both of theſe Titles which ſo nerely touch vs, are found and contained in one text. Briefly, S. Paul commended vnto his Diſciple Timothee (1. Tim. 1. 18. to Warre a good Warre, in this his Pilgrimage. Now as a man vndertaking a long iorney, thorough a contrie, and way, full of dangers, but well furniſhed and provided with all kindes of neceſſaries, hauing ſtore of monie in his purſe, meate and prouiſion in his Wagon or Coache, weapons deſſenciue and offenciue, impa-thing him ſelfe in the beſt, knowen and common way, beſet with good markes on euery ſide, with an expert guide, and ſtore of good company (as a ſtrong Conuoye) to conduct him, may truly be ſaid to take a ſafer Way, then he who only is provided with one or two of theſe particulars, yet wanteth halfe or moſt of the reſt the other hath, euen ſo is it in this our iorney towards heauen, thorough the deſert of this world; wherein he may be truly ſaid to take the ſafer and ſecurer way, that ſetteth forward beſt furniſhed and beſt provided with all ſorts of neceſſaries, for ſo long, ſo dangerous, and ſo doutfull a iorney.

This preſuppoſed, and it being further confeſſed, that Catholiques and Proteſtants are of far different iudgement in their choice and election, inſiſt vpon far different principles for their ſecuritie,

rise, vse far different weapons for their defence, and vndertake far contrary wayes to accomplish this iorney, we will therfore examine the principles of the one, and of the other, the weapons, the way, the necessarie prouision, the Conuoy which they take along with them, how far they walke together the same way, where, and when they separate themseluee asunder: so shall we plainly see, whether of them go best prouided, and whether of them, euen in comon sence, may be said to walke the *Safer Way*.

Doubtes the greatest error that can be in the Doctrine or Action of any man, is, an error in the principles, or first beginning, because vpon these, all the whole Doctrine or Action doth depend; In so much that if the principles be erroneous, or but so much as dubious in the lest degree, no certaintie or securitie can be founded in any point of the doctrine deriued from them. We will therfore compare the principles wherein Protestants do differ from vs, together with our grounds and principles by which we differ from them: so shall we clearly discern and see, whether ours, or theirs, be the more certaine; and the indifferent Reader iudge, whether Doctrine teacheth the more secure and *Safer Way*, to passe this *Pilgrimage* and this *Warsfare*.

Touching this point therfore in particular, there be indeed some few principles, in which we both like very good friends agree together; for example, that the holie scripture being rightly vnderstood,

stood, is of diuine and infallible authoritie; That some parts therof is to be vnderstood litterally, according to the first and primarie sound of the words them selues: other parcells figuratiuely, or in a mysticall and spirituall sence. And thus far we walke together, as it were hand, in hand the same way; vntill wenext come to the number of Bookes, as also to their sence and meaning; and here lo, the two *Wayes* deuide asunder; the Trauellers are of different iudgements, and leaue the friendlie companie of one another in this iorney; the Catholiques still persisting in the old and ordinarie way, receiued time out of minde from their forefathers; Protestants going out of the ancient Way, into new pathes of their owne inuention, neuer trod before by any wise and prudent Traueller; And without a reconcilment of these essentjall differences, there can be no meanes of euer meeting, or euer walking together in one way. To paralel and instance the same in particulars, and to make the case cleare and sure, and that with infinit aduantage on the Catholiques side, that he goeth better provided to passe this Pilgrimage then the Protestant doth.

I.

Touching the *Number of Bookes* of holie scripture, we are far better furnished for our iorney then are they, for we admit all those Bookes of scripture which they admit, and besides, some dosen more which they reiect, though confest for Canonically by that great *S. Austen*, and all other,
both

both Councells and orthodox Fathers for about these thousand yeares together. Now if the written word of God, according to the Prophet *Dauid* (psal. 118.) be a *lanterne to our feete*, and according to *S. Paul* (Ephes. 6. 17.) *the sword of the spirit*; if we haue so many lanternes to light vs in this our doutfull and obscure way, if we haue so many swords and weapons to defend vs, more then they, how is not ours, by the helpe of so many diuine lanternes; which Protestants lack, by the defect of so many spirituall swords and weapons wherof they are deprived (euen in comon sense and reason) to be certainly held for the *Safer Way*, and we supposed to goe the better provided for our Pilgrimage?

II.

Touching the *Sence*, meaning, and interpretation of those sacred Bookes admitted by both (a point so principall, and so important) a Protestant generally, admits no other Iudge, or Iudiciall interpreter therof, then him selfe, or euery priuat person conferring one place with another; no, not the definitiue voice and verdict, of his whole Reformed Church, further then in his owne goodly iudgment, she agrees with the written word. But this can be no secure or certaine way, because there is no infallibilitie for this his Rule of interpretation. For if his whole Reformed Church may erre in deliuering the sence of scripture, how may not him selfe alone erre in deliuering the same sence? If the whole (when of him selfe

selfe is the least part) may faile in conferring place
 with place, how may not he (single, and alone)
 especially mens Dictamens being so different?
 Contrariwise we Catholiques, rely not vpon our
 owne, but vpon the verdict and indgement of the
 vniuersall Church. Now, if the verdict and iudg-
 ment of the vniuersall Church, of so many Prelats
 and Pastors assembled together (who doubtles re-
 present the whole) be the more secure course to
 finde out the sence of sacred scripture, we relying,
 we furnished with so many helpes, and yet vsing
 our owne priuat industrie & spirit as well as they,
 and moreouer hauing the word of God it selfe, de-
 liuered in the same Bookes, and that in a dosen
 more then they haue for our helpe and warrant in
 this our way, especially Christ our guide and Cap-
 taine, willing vs to *beare the Church*, how haue we
 not better helpes to vnderstand the sence then
 Protestants haue? and how euen in common sence,
 is not ours the *Safer Way*?

III.

Protestants affirme, teache, and freely confesse
 of their owne Church, that she may *Erre*, yea, it is
 21. Article of their Churches faith, that she her
 selfe can erre, *euen in matters appertayning to God*.
 We both teache and hould the contrary of our
 Church, that she neither euer did, doth, or euer
 possibly can erre; for she *cannot any thing against*
the truth 2. Cor. 13. 8. Hauing *nether spot nor wrin-*
cle in her doctrine Ephes. 5. 27. Being *sanctified in*
the truth Iohn. 17. 17. Being *the firmament and pil-*
lat

lar of the truth. 1. Tim. 3. Having the infallible promise of the highest that *his spirit shall not depart from her mouth, nor from the mouth of her seede, nor of her seedes seede, from hence forth and for ever,* I say 59. 21. As being *deffoused to him in faith for ever.* 2. Cor. 11. 2. Now such is the condition of the Church of God, or it is not. Such is the condition of our Church, in our owne doctrine: such is not the condition of the Protestant Church in their owne iudgement. If therfore they may be saued in a Church that in her owne iudgement may erre, *euén in matters appertayning to God,* if they walke in a secure way, who walke in the company of such a Church, how much more are we secure in such a Church, as by the promise of God him selfe, nether did, doth, nor yet can erre in matters of faith, much lesse confesseth this frailtie of her selfe? Therefore euén in common sence, ours must needes be confessed to be the *safest Way.*

I V.

To descend from the Scriptures and Church, to the *Head* of the Church. Protestants teache, that our Soueraigne (his royall Maiestie) is supream *Head* of the whole English, Scottish, and Irish Church, and that (as they pretend) to be proued out of Scripture: meane while the Protestants of France, as also of other Reformed Churches, from the same Scripture, Rule, and principle, teach, and stoutly stand to it, that he is not, but that the *Presbiterie* of euery parishe, is supream of it selfe, differing herein one from another *ex diametro.* And
here

here (as shame it is to say it) they walke alone without any other Church in the whole world to beare them companie, yea them selues forsake the companie of one another in their way. Meane while, all Catholiques, in all the Catholique Westerne Churches thoroughout the world (many in number, and of many nationis) do all confesse, houlde, and acknowledge, one Soueraigne Priest and Pastor, one head and conductor of the whole. Now if many Churches be wiser then one. If many nationis, if many kinges and kingdomes be wiser then one. If the way wherin so many thousands walke, be more secure then that wherein so few do walke alone, then ours so many, assenting all to one *Head*, euen in common sence, must needes be confest to be the *Safer Way*.

V.

Protestants hould, that his Maiesties Resolutions in matters of faith (whom they belecue to be *Head* in all Ecclesiasticall causes within the kingdome next after God) though assisted with his Lords, both spirituall and temporall, yet hath no such assured assistance in his Resolutions of faith, as that they may safely without further enquire, rely and aduenture their soules vpon them. Contrary whereto, we constantly belecue and rely thereon, that what the *Head* of the Catholique Church shall resolute *ex cathedra*, is of vndouted and infallible verity, God him selfe ordayning, that he who would not stand to the decree of the high priest, should die the death; and to say the truth, it is a mocke-

tie to entitle him *Head* in all Ecclesiasticall causes, vpon whose resolutions the members of the same *Head* dare not rely in matters of faith. In this point therefore we haue certaintie, they haue none; They in their owne iudgment, follow an erring *Head*, we not: ours therefore euen in comon sence, must needes be confessed the *safer Way*.

V I.

We haue troupes of holy *Councells* with vs in our way. Contrariwise Protestants contemne and oppose the authoritie of all sacred and holy *Councells*, which haue bene lawfully called and held in the Catholique Church, for these last eleuen hundred or thousand yeares: they cannot name so much as one, which they will approue in all points of faith. We only are they who doe embrace them, and do defend them against all opponents: we take them with vs in our way, as an inuincible conuoye to conduct vs. Ours therefore, euen in comon sence, must needes be confessed the *safer Way*.

V I I.

We haue troupes of *Fathers* with vs in our way. They oppose and reiect the whole streame of Ancient *Fathers*, Bishops, and Doctors which haue bene in the Church of God for these last eleuen hundred, or thousand yeares. They cannot name so much as one, of eminent fame, whom they will approue in all points of faith. We defend them and their quarell, we patronise them against both Protestants, Puritans, and all their opposers: we willingly take them with vs in our way.

D d d.

Yea

Yea, those which themselves held for their owne Fathers and first founders, within the compasse of these last hundred yeares (as *Luther*, *Caluin*, and the like) them selues at this day doe quite reiect them, nor dare auouch one halfe of their doctrine. Ours therefore, euen in common sence, must needes be confessed the *Safer Way*.

VIII.

We only, we anciently, we truly, can plead *Possession*, as our proper right and patrimonie, to all ancient monuments, in Italie, Spaine, France, England, and in all other Christian contries vnder heauen, for these thousand yeares & vpwards. We haue built in this time, all Churches, Chapels, Monasteries, Hospitalls that were euer founded from the first entrance of Christianitie into our kingdome, to King Harrie the eight, as so many Innes, Lodgings, & Harbours to refresh our selues in, in our iorney, whose lustre to this very day, doth maruellously dazell, the eyes both of Turkes Iewes, and all Infidels when they behould them. Protestants all this while neuer setting vp so much as one poore half-peny Alehouse, to refresh a Pilgrime in his way; Yea, any Pagan may freely bid them put out his eye with any one Church, Chappell, or worke of pietie, founded or erected at their expences. If they can disproue this, let them at least (though the men be dead) shew vs but the stones, the timber, or but one only brick of any such building. Now what Pilgrime, well in his witts, will walke in such away, as can afford

afford him in his iorney, nether house nor harbour, nor so much as a hole to hide his head in, and leaue that, let and enriched with so many noble lodgings, to entertaine him and bid him welcome. Ours therfore, euen in common sence, must needes be confessed the *safer way*.

I X.

Wee haue *Vniuersalitie*, set vp as a marke in our way, which they haue nor. *Sir Humfrey* disclaymes the same as any marke of his Reformed Church: yet both the holy Scriptures, and our common Creede assure vs, that the true Church must needes be *Catholique*, or *Vniuersall*. She must extend her selfe to *all the ends of the earth*. psal. 97. 3. She must be as the *grasse of the earth*. psal. 71. 16. *Euery knee* must be bowed to God, and *euery tongue* must sweare to him. Isay 48. 19. *The multitude of the sea*, must be conuerted to him, Isay 60. 5. She shall exceede for number, the *Starres of beauen* and the *sandes of the sea shore*, Ieremy 33. 22. She must be *a mountaine*, filling the whole earth. Dan. 2. 35. The gospel of this kingdome must be preached to the *whole world*. Mat. 24. 14. It must be testified before *Kinges*, and preached to *all Nations*. Marc. 13. 10. Lastly it must be a Church redeemed to God in the blood of his sonne, out of *euery tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation*. Apoc. 5. 9. Our Church only hath this marke, or none other in the whole world. She hath bene extant in all *ages* and in all *places*, whersoever *Christianitie* hath bene planted. Name vs an *Age*, name

vs a *Place* vnder heauen, cōuerted to Christ where we were not in infinit numbers. By this argument we are able to conuince the Iewes them selues, euen out of their owne scriptures: but a Iew would quite and easilie haue confounded any Protestant, making this demand vnto him at *Luthers* arising. Therefore by the helpe of this euident markē, euen in comon sence, ours must needs be confest the *Safer Way*. X.

After Antiquitie and Vniuersallitie, we haue the marke of *Vnitie*, which they haue not. The true Church of Christ, must according to holy scripture, be a people, all of *one law*. Exod. 12. 49. She must be the *chosen lip* of our Lord, which cannot lie. Sophon 3. 9. *The lip of truth*, which shall be stable for euer. Pro. 12. 19. She is a *kingdome*. Dan. 2. 44. which is only one. She is a *Spouse*. Cant. 6. 8. the which is one. She is a *Sheepfold*. Iohn 10. 16. the which is one, and guided only by *one Pastor*. She must therefore be *one spirit*, and of *one minde*. Philip. 1. 26. She must be of *one meaning*, agreeing in one, *nothing in contention*. Phillip. 2. 2. She must glorifie God with *one minde*, and with *one mouth*. Rom. 5. 15. Now, who knowes not, that we English, Spaniards, Frēch, Italians, Scotch, Irish, Almans, and Indian Catholiques (though so far distant) are all gouerned by the staffe of one only Shepheard? Truly, it must needs be granted, that this *Vnion* is great in the Citty of God, where all the Citizens of the whole world, acknowledge one only soueraigne Magistrate to gouerne their
soules.

foyles. That this so ample house, is well vnited, where all obey to one Father : and the vnitie of the *Head*, must needes evidently shew, the vnitie of the bodie. Can all, or any Protestants of the world pretend this? Suppose his Maiestie of England, should command, yea or request the Reformed French or Dutch Church, to admit his 39. English Articles for points of faith, him selfe for head of the whole Reformed Church, or but to admit Bishops thorough all their French or Dutch assemblies, would they ether obey him, yea or their owne naturall King so commanding? How cleare is it then, euen in comon sence, that by this other so euident marke, ours must needes be confest the *Safer Way*?

X I.

For another assured marke to direct our Pilgrime in his passage, we haue *lawfull Calling* which they haue not. Now, as in nature, no man can possiblie make him selfe, so to this kinde of Calling, no man can Call him selfe. We (who only can Call, next after God) Called them not: how come they then to this honor, not being Called? The lack of this marke in the Reformed Church, causeth the wandering and erring Protestant Pilgrime, by a thousand subtrill flights, to inbreast him selfe in our bolome. Yea, this Catholique marke is so cleare, so euident, and out of question on our side, that if any being ordered by vs, and (going out of their way) goe to them, they forthwith admit them into their Ministrie, with-

out giuing them any other Orders : we admitting none of theirs (though stiled a Bishop) into ours, vnles they be first newlie cald and ordered againe by vs, because indeed they were neuer trulie ordered before: which clearly conuinceth, that neuer lawfull Priest or Bishop, was euer made, out of the Catholique Roman Church. Ours therefore both in common sence, and by their owne confessions, must needes be granted to be the *Safer Way*.

XII.

We haue *Mission*, or lawfull sending, for a marke in our way, which Protestants lack, who without lawfull *Calling*, or lawfull *Sending*, Ordinarie from man, or Extraordinarie from God, haue of their owne Authoritie, intruded themselves in the highest charge that is in the Church; as is, to preach the word, administer the Sacraments, and the like, belonging to them, no more then to me, so opening the gap to all false Prophets, and setting Hirelings and rauening Wolves, to gouerne the sheepe of Iesus Christ. Contrary to that of the Apostle: *how shall they preach vnles they be sent*. Of this they haue no coulour at all wherewith to accuse the Catholique Church, which marke alone sufficeth to conuince our *Mission* to be lawfull, theirs not; and consequentially, euen in common sence, ours to be confest the *Safer Way*.

XIII.

From Scriptures, the Church, Councells, Fathers

thers and her Pastors, to come to *SACRAMENTS* (the liuely fountaines of this life, whereat to refresh our wearie Pilgrime in his passage) they themselves account but two, wherof the one wanteth the principall, and most substantiall part belonging to it. We haue *Seauen*, perfect and entire in all points, and instituted by Christ him selfe, as I haue already proued in his proper place. Now, if we haue *Seauen* refreshing fountaines, and they but two. If we haue grace actually conserd in, and by them euery one, the better to passe this wearie way; If euen those two of theirs giue no more grace in many of their owne opinions, then they may get by saying their prayers, or by performing some other good or pious worke, without the vse of any Sacrament, how is not ours, euen in comon sence, the much more secure and *Safer Way*?

XIV.

Amongst all these refreshing fountaines, there is one far surpassing all the rest, in taste and virtue, contayning substantially, the liuely and viuifying body and blood of our Sauour him selfe, which serueth as the true foode and liquor of life to sustaine our Pilgrime in his passage; Now, what tongue of man is able to tell, the vnspeakable comfort this must needs cause, to him who walketh in this dangerous way, and findeth therein so sweet a companion and refreshing. Not by faith alone, not in a signe alone, not figuratiuely, not metaphorically, but really and personally as euer he walked on earth, with the two Disciples which

went to Emmaus. Haue Protestants this Superstitionall foode, to sustaine, them with in their iorney? Haue they Christ himselve to beare them companie, as Catholiques haue? If they haue not, then must they needes confes, euen in common sence, ours to be the *Safer Way*.

122

X V.

We haue a publique and externall *Sacrifice*, to offer with vs in our way: they haue none, but only the improper and metaphoricall Sacrifice of praier to appeale the wrath of God, and to obtaine his fauour if they offend him in their iorney. We haue Prayer as well as they, and besides prayer, we haue the proper, reall, and incruentall Sacrifice of the Altar, to offer to him for our selues in this necessitie. Ours therefore euen in common sence, must needes be confest the *Safer Way*.

X V I.

To proceede from Sacraments, vnto virtues, as to certaine weapons necessarily appertayning to our Pilgrime. Protestants pretend to haue *Faith* in Christ, and that only to suffice to their saluation. We ioyne together with faith, *Hope*, and *Charitie*, granted by *S. Paul* him selfe to be greater then faith (1. Cor. 13. 13.) If we hould three diuine virtues to be of necessitie in this voyage, and they but one. If one of ours, by the Apostles verdir, be the greatest of all the diuine virtues. If they walke safely armed with that one virtu alone, we must needes walke more safely that walke armed with all three: and consequently ours, euen in comon sence,

sence, must needs be confest the *saser Way*.

XVII.

Protestants pretend principally & solely to rely vpon the merits of Christ. We rely vpon the selfe same merits, principally, and solely too, as the causes of grace and saluation: yet we rely likewise vpon *Good Workes*, done by the grace of Christ, as causes of glorie (conditionally required by Christ himselfe) and vpon the reward promised by Christ for the working of them; Conforme to that of the Prophet *Dauid*, *I haue enclined my hart to do thy iustifications for euer, for reward* (psl. 118. 112. Conforme to that of the Sonne of God assuring vs, *Who so shall giue a cup of water in my name, shall not loose his reward* (Marc. 9. 41.) The same veritie further assuring, that he coming in the glorie of his Father, *Will rendre to euerye man according to his Workes*. And his great Apostle peremptorily willing vs, *to labour the more, that by good Workes you make sure your vocation and election* (2. Pet. 1. 10.) Lo, by good workes we are the more assured of our election. Now, we apprehend, we apply vnto vs, the whole merits of Christ as well as they, and besides, the reward and merit of our owne good workes, done by the grace of the same Christ. We therefore furnished with this worthy weapon which they want, euen in common sence, must needs be confest to be better furnished for our *Way*.

XVIII.

Protestants pretend to haue accessse vnto the throane of grace, only by their owne praier; We, besides

besides our owne, haue acesse to the same throane by the powerfull *Intercession of Saints and Angels*, who Scripture assureth do pray for vs, and that we also may pray to them. (Zachary 1. 9. Tob. 12. 12. Apoc. 9. 8. Baruch 3. 4. Machab. 15. 14.) And *S. Iohn* saith, that the number of these subordinat Intercessors is so great, that no man is able to number them. Now, if we, together with Christ, haue the powerful prayers of Saints and Angels, which they haue not; If we haue such an innumerable Conuoy to beare vs companie, and they not one pure creature besides them selues; Briefly, if we haue a particular Angell keeper, which neuer leaues vs to our iornies end, ours euen in common sence, must needes be confest the *Safer Way*.

XIX.

We haue *Miracles* (as another notable marke) to assure vs in our way, they haue none. When God led the people of Israel thorough the desert (Exod. 13. 21.) he gaue them a miraculous pillar of a cloud by day, and another of fire by night, to conduct them in their Pilgrimage. Moyses proued his calling and preaching, to be from God, by the testimonie of the Miracles which he wrought. Our Sauour, to confound his aduersaries, argued thus. *If I had not done amongst the Works, that no other mā hath done, they should not haue sinne* (Ioh. 15. 24.) His Apostles & Disciples, wrought many strange & stupedious Miracles. Haue Protestants wrought so much as one? He promised that this powerfull gift, should remaine also with the faithfull their
suc-

successors, to the end, saying, **Preach** my gospel to all nations (Marc. 16. 16.) *Them that beleeue, these signes shall follow, they shall cast out Devils &c.* And *he that beleeueth in me, the workes that I doe he also shall do, and greater then these shall he do* (Iohn 14. 12.) We proue this marke was giuen by God vnto the Church; how proue they, or where read they, that it was euer taken from it? Yea Protestants confesse in their owne Bible, printed anno 1576. that Miracles ought to shine for euer in the Church, and yet haue neuer wrought any. He that wrote the *Appendix* against *Sir Hum.* proueth miracles to haue bene wrought, in all the first six seuerall ages. We further produce miracles in euery seuerall age since our Sauour vnto vs (as is to be seene, Protestants Apologie pag. 533.) which of them all was wrought by a Protestant? Now what man in his right wits would leaue such a way, as is particularly lighted, marked and guided from heaven, by such a miraculous and fierie Pillar? *Nicodemus* said vnto our Sauour; *We know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man could do these Miracles thou dost, except God be with him* (Iohn 3. 2.) and we may truly say the like, that Catholiques are the teachers come from God, for no man could doe the Miracles they do, except that God him selfe were with them. Ours therefore, even in comon sense, must needs be confest the *Safer Way*.

XX.

They haue only helpe for their soules whilst they are in this life, but none after, whatsoever
needs

neede or distres the same may stand in: and who knoweth for certaine, what becometh of his owne soule? Contrariwise, we continually asist one another euen *After death*; Their Charitie towards one another, dyeth together with the body: ours liueth long after the body is dead and rotten? If it be the soule of a Saint, we pray vnto it. If the soule of a penitent sinner, we cease not to power our prayers for it. This did the godly *Iudas Machabeus* for the soules of his bretheren which were slaine in battaile (2. Machab. 12. 44.) gathering an offering of two thousand drachmes of siluer, which he sent to the Priests of Ierusalem to haue them praid for, knowing that *it is an holy cogitation to pray for the dead*: knowing, that *by the blood of the comenant, prisoners are led forth of the pit*, Zacharie 9. 11. knowing, that *our Lord bringeth downe to hell, and back againe* 1. Samuel 2. 6. knowing, that some *are saued*, yet so as by fire: 1. Cor. 3. 13. knowing, that to some there is the *loosing the sorowes of hell*, euen after this life, Acts. 2. 14. And what Apocriphall saying haue Protestants to oppose this? Will they say, that he who gathered those two thousand Drachmes, or all those who gaue those two thousand Drachmes, or the Priests of God to whom they were giuen to that purpose, were all fooles and no wiser then woodcocks in respect of them? Alwayes, we haue the example and company of so many thousands, to walke along with vs in our way, nor was there one Protestant present, who did oppose this, religious

gious fact of the people or Priests. Therefore, euen
in common sence, ours must needs be confest the
Safer Way. XXI.

Finally, if mony sayle them in their Way (as
oft it doth to men in trauaile) they haue not a
friend nether in this world nor the next, to lend
them a penny, but only runne to Christ, without
any one to giue their word for them, if he refuse
to trust them vpon their owne. We goe to him
also as well as they; and besides, we haue recourse
in such a want, to the comon and inexhaustible
Treasure of the Church, wherof the Apollile *S. Paul*
said; *I doe accomplish those thinges that want of the*
passions of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is the
Church, Colos. 1. 24. *Ieremie*, *S. Iohn Baptist*, the
iust *Iob*, and many blessed and holy Martyrs, haue
suffered more for Christs sake, then euer their
owne sinnes deserued. *Would to God my sinnes, by*
which I haue prouoked the Wrath of God, and the ca-
lamitie which I suffer, were waighed in a ballance;
like the sand of the sea, this would seeme more heauie,
said that incomparable mirror of Patience amongst
men. Shall these sufferings and labours, be all
lost? God forbid. The want therefore of one part,
is in this case, charitably recompenced by the store
of another: so that, as Christ our head, with all
his elect, make one mysticall, comon, and publi-
que bodie, so his suffrings, with those of his mem-
bers, concur to make vp one generall Treasure.
Here we can borrow: here we can helpe our sel-
ues, out of this comon purse of our pittifull Mo-
ther.

ther. We haue our passport from scripture for it. This Protestants cannot do. They haue no such common Treasure as this to haue recourse vnto. Ours therefore, euen in comon sence, must needes be confest the *Safer Way*.

Hitherto haue I shewed by aboute Twenty Reasons, that the Protestant Pilgrime, euen according to common sence, walketh in a Dangerous Way; somtimes without any certaine markes or tokens to direct him; sometimes all alone without any companie (friend, or foe) to follow him one only foote; sometimes halfe armed; sometimes halfe famished for the lack of foode; alwayes without any farthing in his purse saue only faith; neuer a friend in another contrie to lend him two pence in time of neede; and alwayes vnder the conduct of an erring guide by his owne confession. Now will I shew by Twenty moe, that granting all to be good in their Religion (which neuer was, nor will be granted) yet still the things wherein they differ from vs, must needes in common sence be granted better; for example.

XXII.

Suppose it good to follow a Church, which confelleth of her selfe that she may *Erre*: yet still in common sence, it is better and more secure, to follow such a Church as affirmeth of her selfe that she cannot *Erre*: Yea, it were absurd in vs to performe, as also in them to perswade, or pull vs out of one Church that may *Erre*; to push vs forcibly into another, that may do the same: for, doe but
suppose

Suppose that the Church can *Erre*, and I cannot see how with a good conscience any Protestant can say his Creed (*I beleene the Catholique Church*) but ether he must speake against his conscience, or his Creed.

XXIII.

Suppose it good to follow a Church, which neuer by any Generall and Oecumeniall Councell, gathered her selfe, and her chiefe Priests and Pastors together into one, for the space of a thousand yeares last past, to settle and compose doubts that haue arisen in matters of faith, so to conserue the whole flock of Christ in peace and concord: yet must it needes be granted to be better, to follow that Church, which hath gathered together, and kept all those that euer were kept from Christ to vs, which out of question is none but ours. Especially Scripture assuring vs, that God hath set such ouer hir, to keepe the whole Church from *Wauering*. Ephes. 4. 11. Whether is better? whether in comon sense more conforme to holy scripture?

XXIV.

Suppose it good to follow a Church who for the deciding of controuersies in faith, appeales to the graue authoritie of the Fathers of the first five hundred yeares: yet must it needes be granted to be better, to adhere to that Church, which appeales to the authority of all the Fathers of fifteen hundred yeares. For what priuiledge had the Fathers of those five, that these haue not of these
fifteen?

fifteene? What did Christ promise to the one, that he denyed to the other? Especially the holy Ghost him selfe giuing vs this counsell. *Aske theould generations, and search diligently in the memory of the Fathers.* Iob 8.8. And againe. *Wise men confesse and hide not their Fathers.* Iob 15. 18. We discouer ours. Protestants conceale theirs; whether in common sence is better? whether more conforme to holie Scripture?

XXV.

Suppose it good, that euery particular man may carue his owne Religion out of Scripture, and iudge both the whole Church, whether she iudge or no according to Scripture, and euen Scripture it selfe also by the Scripture? Yet must it needes be granted better, yea and more secure humbly to renounce a mans owne iudgement, and to rely vpon the voice and verdict of the whole Church, then vpon the priuat opinion of one alone. Especially sith the word it selfe assureth vs, that no *Scripture is of priuat interpretatiō.* Nether do we comprehend the Pope within thele limits, whom we hould to be in this case, not a priuat, but a publique person, and to whom thole words of our Sauiour do belong peculiarly. *I haue prayed for thee Peter that thy faith faile not, and thou once conuersed, confirme thy bretheren.* Luc. 22. 31.

XXVI.

Suppose it good and seemely, that a young child, a tender mayden, or a meere secular Prince, may be head of the Church in all causes Ecclesiastically,

fitcall? Yet must it needes be granted to be better, and more decent, this Excellencie to be placed in a Priest, Prelat, and Ecclesiasticall Prince, especially sith the holy scripture saith; *I suffer not a woman* (much lesse a child) *to speake in the Church.* And what sence is there that she should be debarred to speake in the Church, if she truly be the head of the Church? See you the absurdity of this your doctrine when *Q. Elizabeth*, and young *K. Edward*, were heads of your Church?

XXVII.

If it be good and honorable, to ioine with that Church, who neuer had any Kinge or Queene of their Religion, for a thouland yeares together before *Luther*, yet it must needes be granted better and more honorable, to ioine with that Church who hath had al the Christian Kings & Queenes that euer were in the whole world of their Religion: which out of question, is only ours. Especially sith holy scripture assureth vs, that Kings should be *Foster fathers*, and Queenes be *Nurses* of the Church; Protestants hauing neuer had so much as one King, or one only Queene of their Religion, from the dayes of *B. Augustin* the Monke and our Apostle, to the dayes of *Luther*, that Apostat.

XXVIII.

If it be good and honorable to ioine with that Church, which neuer had any Bishop of their Religion (nether *Nomine*, nor *Re*) for these almost thousand yeares, from *S. Austen* our first Bishop,

vnto vs, it must needes be granted better and more honorable, to ioyne with that Church, which hath had al the venerable Bishops that euer were, from our first conuersion, vnto this present: both which point of Kings and Bishops, are exactly enumerated, and orderly recounted in that learned booke of the Prudentiall Ballance, and is out of question to be only verified in our Church, euen that part alone comprised in England, Especially sith holy scripture assureth vs, that God hath placed Bishops in the Church to gouerne the same. If you can recount vs any (Protestant fully) before *Cranmer*, name so much but as one vnto vs, and for that one Bishops sake, I will acquit you of all the rest.

XXIX.

If it be good and honorable, to be a childe of such a Mother, as neuer brought forth one only sonne of any eminent sanctitie? It must needes be granted much better and much more honorable, to be a child of such a Mother, as hath brought forth hundreds, yea thousands of Saints, as well of men as women, rare and singular for their sanctitie, as *S. Benner* the Father, *S. Gregorie* and *S. Austen* both his sonnes (and our Apostles) *S. Bede*, *S. Bernard*, *S. Francis*, *S. Dominick*, *S. Clare*, *S. Catharine*, and *Teresa of Iesus*. Especially sith the scripture saith that our Lords abode is, *in the full assembly of the Saints*. Eccles. 24. 16. Nor can I see how with a secure conscience Protestants can re- peate that article of their Creed. *I beleue the Com-*

union of Saints, who neuer had a Saint of their profession for aboue these thousand yeares. Let them name but any one, Protestant fully, for these thousand yeares last past, and for his sake alone, I will singe aloud, that they are all Saints.

XXX.

If it be good or secure, to adhere to such a Church, as for this thousand yeares, neuer confounded pagan, nor confirmed her owne doctrine to her owne faithful with any stupendious worke or miracle, how much better and more secure must it needes be granted to be, to adhere to such a Church, who hath both confounded her foes, and most clearly comforted and strenghtned the faith of her friends with such numbers of vnderstandable signes and wonders, as none can deny, but he that will set him selfe on high to be gazed and wondered at by the whole world? Especially it being grounded in holy scripture; *And them that beleue, these signes shall followe &c.* Yea a pagan King was moued by this only Motiue, to decree thus. *That in all myne Empire and my kingdome, they dread and feare the God of Daniel &c. He is the deliuerer and Sauour, doing signes and maruells.* Let them name but one only that they haue wrought (in defence of their faith, as it differeth from vs) like to that wrought on *Iohn Clement* yet alius, & for that one miracles sake, let them account me a monster, if I turne not to them.

XXXI.

If it be good to ioyne with a Church which

hath no sacred Ancient monument, no rare or pretious Relique, no miraculous or heavenly prodigie in her *deposito*, it must needes be granted to be much better to ioyne with such a Church which hath so great store and number of those heavenly pearles and pledges, as is part of the same Crosse, sprinkled with the blood that did redeeme vs. The very nayles that clenched those sacred handes of him, that made the heauens. Holy Oyle sent from heauen. Holy Manna sent from heauen. Holy Candles sent from heauen, both which my selfe with thousands more haue seene in Arras. Especially sith many such pearles of price were euer found in the old law, as the Rod of *Moyse*, the Tables of the Law, the Manna made by the handes of Angels, the bodie of *Elisau* and the like. Can Protestants shew but one such pearle and heauenly pledge?

XXXII.

If it be good to be a member of such a Church, as hath not so much as one only holy place to re-
paire vnto, sanctified from heauen by God him-
selfe, it must needes be granted to be better to be
a member of such a Church, which hath so many
sacred and holy harbours to re-
paire vnto, as the
sanctuary of *Loretto* in Italy, *Sichem* in Flaun-
ders, of *Montserrat*, *Guadalupe* & others in Spaine;
&c. of which that may be truly said to those that
stand in those holy places, which God him selfe
said to *Moyse*. Put off thy shoes, becaule the place
wheron thou standest, is holy ground. Haue Pro-
testante

~~do~~stante any such place to repaire vnto? I thinke them selues will say no. All their depositums, all their Places, with whatsoeuer they haue in their possession, being in their owne iudgements, wholly prophane, nothing bearing the name of holy saue only their Bible, which yet our late soueraigne censured as corrupt, and vnholly.

XXXIII.

To cometo Acts of virtu and Christian perfection. If it be good and secure for them to lead the life of perfection, and yet to keepe still all their wealth in their owne possession, how much better it is, and more secure for vs, that forsake all to follow Christ? If a Camel (with the bunch on his back) can goe thorough, the eye of their Euangelicall needle, how much more easily may one of ours passe thorough, who like the spinner hath vnbowelled, and twisted him selfe, and all his wealth and worldly substance, into so fine and smale a thrid, as he may truly say with the Apostle. *Behould we haue left all to follow thee?* Can they present vs one of their Religion to be paralld to a poore Capucin? To put on which poore state of life, rich Princes haue disrob'd them selues in our Religion.

XXXIV.

If mariage be good and honorable in all, as well Priests as other, yet vnspotted virginities must needes be granted to be much better, both because Christ him selfe was a virgin priest, *S. Iohn the Apostle*, and *S. Paul*, with other moe, all vir-

gins: who saith in expresse tearmes, he that giueth his virgin in mariage, doth well, but he that giues her not, doth better; and Christ him selfe the spouse of virgins teacheth, that some had made them selues chaste for the kingdome of heauens sake. Mariage fills the earth, virginity replenisheth heauen. Angels liue without flesh, but virgins haue victorie euen ouer their flesh, saith *S. Bernard.*

XXXV.

If it be good and secure for a man, to direct his life according to his owne conceit, without *Obedience* to any set or prescribed religious Rule, it must needs be granted to be much better, and more secure for a man to be subiect to a well experimented guide and Superior in that sacred facultie, whose counsell may instruct him, whose example may direct him, who (as a charitable Father) may when he erreth rectifie and correct him. *Obedience* (saith that Master of obedience, who was made obedient, euen to the death of the Crosse) *is better then sacrifice.* Phil. 2. An obedient man speaketh victories Pro. 21. As the Sonne of the highest, so the obedient saith *salomon.* Eccles. 4. It is a great quietnes to haue charge of nothing. It is a hard thing to command as one ought: most easie to obey being well commanded. The truly obedient, makes him selfe an absolute Lord ouer all thinges. Shew vs this virtu in like perfection with you, as it is with vs, and I shall praise your new Reformation, about your owne imagination.

XXXVI.

XXXVI.

If eating of all sorts of meates, and at all times alike, be good and laudable; doubtles *Fasting* from some meates, and in some seasons, for religion sake, must needs be better; both for the conseruation and augmentation of the creatures themselves, ease of the common wealth, taming and subduing of our rebellious flesh, so to make the same subiect to the spirit, and to appease our Lord being angrie with vs. How well knew he this who said. I chastice my flesh and bring it in subiection; lest when I preach to others my selfe become a Reprobate? What say you to our Crucified Minimes and Carthusians, to our Carmilites and poore Clares, who neuer eat flesh during life? Was *John Baptist* a foole for his rigorous life and kind of fasting? Or can you point me out one such Protestant?

XXXVII.

If it be good to sleepe all night at your ease, and yet notwithstanding that you be still secure of your saluation, it must needs be granted better and much more secure for such as rise at midnight, in the cold of winter, spending sundry houres in the dead of the night to the prayes of almightie God, when as your selues lye fast as sleepe. Especially sith we finde the same, both commended in holy scripture, and so much praised in the primitiue times. First by Christ him selfe Luc. 16. 12. who passed, as the holy scripture saith, whole nights in prayer; In that deuout and

virtuous widdow *S. Anne*, as also in *Paul*, *Silas* and other persons *Act. 26. 6.* What comparison is there betwixt your profession and ours in this particular?

XXXVIII.

If it be good and secure, that a man hauing sinned mortally, may be saued, by Protestant repentance only, it must needes be granted better and more secure, both before God and man, when true Contrition, is accompaigned with sincere and sorrowfull Confession, and with a fruitfull Satisfaction for the sinne. Especially sith holy scripture tells vs, such strange penances of holy persons, as King Achab 3. *Reg. 21. 27.* Who covered his flesh with haire-cloth, and for his penance and humilitie, was pardoned of our Lord. And 1. *Paralip. 21. 16.* King David and the ancients clothed shed in haire-cloth, fell flat on the earth before the Angell that slew the people; and obtayned pardon. In a word, sith *S. Austen* tells vs peremptorily. *Non dimittitur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum.* The sinne is not pardoned, without the thing stolne be restored.

XXXIX.

If it be good and secure to be ioyned to such a Church, as neuer conuerted any barbarous nation to the faith and gospell of Iesus Christ, Christ commanding the Pastors of his Church to preach his gospell to barbarous and vnbeleeuing nations, how much better and more secure must it needes be granted, to be vnited to, such a Church,
that

that hath conuerted all nations in the world that at this day beleue in Christ? Which out of all question is only ours.

XXXX.

If it be good to ioine with a Church, who for these thousand yeares neuer]condemned any notable Heretick rising vp against the gospell; nor neuer censured any heresie with Anathema, it must needs be granted to be much better to ioine our selues to such a Church, as hath condemned all Heretickes that euer were, and cast forth the scabbie sheepe from the flock of Iesus Christ, so to preserue the fould in safetie; Who can deny our Church only to haue done this?

Lastly to close vp this vnto the Reader; Many Protestants confesse, that Roman Catholiques may be saued in their Religion: but no Catholique euer said so of any Protestant, dying peruersly in his heresie. Their Protestant faith, as they say, once being had, cannot be lost: and consequentially, a Protestant becoming Catholique, by their owne confession, can not be damned. What good then is there in any point of Protestant professiō, which is not in our Catholique with infinit perfectiō & aduantage? What mediū cōducible to any virtue, wherein we do not out-strip the infinitlie? Which presupposed, it is more cleare then the sunne at noone day, that Catholique Religion is euery way better, euery way Safer, and euery way more tending to perfection, then that of Protestants. Wherto, sweet Iesus, for thy tender

der mercie sake , reduce all those who are alienated and goe astray , as thou didst me , vnworthie sinner, into that Truly Safe Way.

Gaude Maria Virgo , cunctas haereses sola interemisti in vniuerso mundo . Ideo , Dignare me laudare te Virgo sacrata, da mihi virtutem contra hostes tuos.

THE TABLE.

A

APOSTOLIQUE.

Protestant Church not Apostolicall.
pag. 34.

Protestants pressed to name their first Apostle.
p. 265.

Antiquitie.

The Antiquity of our Religion confest by Protestants, and by M. D. Humfrey and M. Preston . Instanced in the Popes Supremacie, Latin service, Masse, Agnus Dei, Transubstan-

tiation Eleuation Adoration , Prayer for the dead, Reliques, Indulgences , Monachisme.
pag. 39. & 42.

See more in Ceremony.

Articles of faith.

Whether the Church can creat new Articles of faith, or not. pag. 199.

See more what is said pag. 540. treating of Indulgences.

Adoration.

The Sacrament to be adored.

The Table.

adored. Proued suppo-
sing the Reall presence.
pag. 51.

Instanced in Protest.
kneeling ibid.

Protestants adore the
creature, instead of the
Creator, as much as we.
pag. 660.

Sir Hum. Absurdities,
and other Protestants
cited by him.

Protestants accuse the
holy Ghost of erring.
pag. 286.

To haue fallen sicke
of a consumption. pag.
299.

Protestants ought to
shew a Church that ne-
uer erred, but was all-
waies directed, and all-
wayes guided by the ho-
lie Ghost, if they will re-
iect ours as erroneous.
pag. 288.

Prot. confessing that
the faith which Christ
and his Apostles taught
in the first age, had visi-
ble professors in all ages,

and yet calling for a Re-
formation of errors,
would seeme to Reforme
the Church of Christ &
his Apostles. p. 296 297.

Prot. Accuse God of
want of wit, for inbrea-
sting Protestants for
1500. yeares in the bo-
some of Papists. pa. 329.

We confest the true
Church & Prot. enen in
our bosome. pag. 330.

Absurdities instanced
in a booke published in
Anselmes dayes about
visitation of the sick.
pag. 344.

Absurdities instan-
ced in opposing priuat
Masse. pag. 380.

B

Bosome.

WE confest the
true Church &
Protestants enen inbrea-
rest in our bosome. p. 330.

The same refuted be-
fore

The Table.

fore by sundry places of
holys scripture p. 398 &c.

Twentie four severall
Reasons, refusing Sir
Humphreys fiction of being
inbreasted in our bosome,
pag. 719. &c.

C

Catalogue.

THe defects of M.
Prestons Catalogue
9. in number, p. 134. &c.

The defects of M. Skin-
ners reply and proceedings
about this controuersie,
p. 167.

The defects of Sir Hum-
freys Reply, discovered, by
the Ans. to M. Skinner,
p. 174.

He is by his owne con-
fession, and offer, to let
the dispute of points of
faith & profession alone,
and to produce his visi-
ble professors in all ages,
p. 183.

He is to shew a Catalo-

gue of visible Professors if
he will iustifie his owne
Church: or assigne the pre-
cise time when errors en-
tered, if he will condemne
ours, p. 298.

His Catalogue urged,
p. 337.

How Sir Hum. should
frame his Catalogue, if
instead of producing the
persons of the faithfull, he
will insist vpon the points
of their faith, p. 351.

Urged instantly, p. 370.
Ceremonies.

Ceremonies confirmed
by Scripture, Instance in
Oyle, p. 18. 19.

Sundry of our Ceremo-
nies, confest to be as an-
cient as our first conuer-
sion. Instance in the Bish.
Palle, those of the Masse.
Purgatorie and prayer for
the Dead, Reliques, Indul-
gences, Monachisme, Pa-
pacie pag, 39. Agnus Dei,
pag. 46.

Instanced in holy Wa-
ter. In Saint Melitus,
brin-

The Table.

bringing in holy vessels,
holy Altar clothes, Reli-
ques of the Apostles and
martyrs, and the Popes,
pass. p. 126.

The signe of the Croße,
Exorcisme, holy bread,
and holy water, deduced
by Sir Hum. from Pope
Alexander and S. Au-
sten. pag. 425.

Confessio & absoluing.

Acknowledged by the
Waldenses. pag. 90. 91.

Confest by K. Cauntus
a pretended Prot. p. 103.

Commandements.

About the diuision of
the ten Com. and the ac-
cusation, that we leane
the second out. pag. 190.

S. Austen proued to de-
mide the as we do. p. 191.

Whether the 2. Com-
mandemēt, be a Morall,
or a Positiue law. p. 501.

Councils.

The Cōncel of Trent
defeded against S. Hum.

pag. 405.

The inerrabilitie of

holy Councils, and their
maner of proceeding to
resolue doubts of faith,
with the obligation of
the faithfull to beleue
them. pag. 54. &c.

The behauiour and
cariage of Catholiques
and Protestants, towards
Generall Councils. pa.
548. &c.

The Council of Trent
compared with former
ancient Councils. p. 552.

The defects of hereti-
cal Connēcticles, to make
them compleat & Gene-
rall Cōncels. p. 255. &c.
Cōmunion in one Kind.

Allowed by Luther.
pag. 280.

Confirmed from the
figures of the old Testa-
ment. pag. 432.

From authorities of
the new. pag. 433.

From miracles. pag.
436. &c.

From the testimonie
of the ancient Fathers.

pag. 439.
From

The Table.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>From the confession
of aduersaries. pag. 441.</p> <p>From Reason. pag. 444.</p> <p>The Institution con-
fessed, the Precept de-
nyed. pag. 453.</p> <p>Diners obiections an-
swered. pag. 453. 454.</p> <p>Proued against Pro-
testants. pag. 605. 651.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Crosse.</p> <p>K. Canutus, a preten-
ded Protestant by M. Pre-
ston, tooke his crowne
from his head, at Win-
chester, and set it vpon
the crucifix. pag. 103.</p> <p>Noetus a pretended
Protestant, receiued a
peece of the holy Crosse,
sent by the Pope to K. Al-
fred. pag. 111.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Contradictions.</p> <p>Instanced in prooffe of
their visible professors.
Sir Hum. pag. 73. 74.</p> <p>Instanced in Monkes
and Friars pag. 85. 95.</p> <p>Instanced about S. Au-
sten our Apostle. pa. 96.</p> <p>Instanced betwixt M.</p> | <p>Montagu and M. Preston.
pag. 107.</p> <p>Instanced in producing
Adelbertus Pragēsis for
a Prot. pag. 117. 119.</p> <p>Instanced in John of
Beuerley. pag. 123. 127.</p> <p>Instanced in S. Austen
and the Monks of Ban-
gor. pag. 130. 131.</p> <p>Instanced in Sir Hum.
accusing the Church of
Rome for creating a new
Creed. pag. 206. 208.</p> <p>Instanced in making
her the Sponse of Christ
and yet a harlot. In the
common Creed. In the
word. pag. 252. &c.</p> <p>Instanced in the preten-
dederring of the church
of Rome. pag. 254. 255.</p> <p>Instanced in the Cano of
their Church p. 265. 266</p> <p>Instanced in the tale
of K. Redwald, Cecenas,
&c. pag. 268. 269.</p> <p>Instanced in his pre-
tension of euery great
Mutation. pag. 318.</p> <p>Instanced in the in-
breasting</p> |
|--|---|

The Table.

*breaffing of Prot. in our
bosome. pag. 329. 330.*

*Instanced in the Su-
premacie of Princes in
their Dominions. p. 333.*

& p. 342.

*Instanced in the Au-
thors cited by him in the
tract of Transubstantia-
tion. pag. 367. 368.*

*Instanced in opposing
of priuat Masse. p. 380.*

& 390. 392. 394.

*Instanced in the 5.
Parag. treating of the 7.
Sacraments. p. 403. 422.*

*Treating of mariage
p. 417.*

*Treating of priests
mariage. p. 418.*

*Treating of Indulgen-
ces. p. 571.*

Corruptions.

*M. Prestons Corrup-
tions. p. 94.*

*Sir Hñ. corrupciōs of-
fered to be shewed p. 160.*

*He is supposed a diuel
& no man (by M. Skin-
ner) who corrupts wil-
fully. p. 171.*

*Sir Hum. conuincēd
of 12. grosse corruptions
in the booke of Bertram.*

p. 201.

*Sir Hum. conuincēd of
more by the author of the
Appendix. p. 202.*

*S. Paul corrupted by
Sir Hñ. about the prooffe
of priuat Masse. p. 383.*

*Scriptures corrupted
by Protestants, proued
from the testimony both
of Papists, and of the best
learned Protestants. p. 622*

*Scripture corrupted
by Sir Hum. p. 652. & p.
656. 657. that of Esay
28. 11.*

*Thirtene euident cor-
ruptions cōuincēd in his
Via Tuta. p. 748. & c.*

D

Deposition of Princes.

D*eposition & mur-
dering of Prin-
ces, approued by Knox
and Buchanan. pa. 102.*

Purs-

The Table.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Puritans haue power
to lay up their Princes in
lincks of Iron. p. 271.</p> <p>Deceits.
See examples. p. 186.
189. 197.</p> <p>Instanced in that ex-
ample of Abraham and
Lot. p. 208. 209.</p> <p>Instanced in that of
the two pretended Sisters
p. 233. 234. 235.</p> <p>Instanced in the Ana-
themas, curses and ex-
communications brea-
shed out by the Church
of Rome against Prote-
stants. p. 248.</p> <p>Instanced in his speak-
ing sometimes well, som-
times ill, of the Church
of Rome p. 250. 251. &c.</p> <p>Gathered from the
title of the 2. Section.
p. 287.</p> <p>Instanced in G. Cas-
sanders pretended reme-
die of Reformation pag.
261. 262.</p> <p>Instanced in the pre-
tended Corruptions of the</p> | <p>Church of Rome. p. 273.</p> <p>Instanced in the title
of the 4. Section. p. 278.</p> <p>Instanced in retorting
his owne words vpon him
selfe. p. 292.</p> <p>Instanced in the title of
the 6. section p. 298. &
p. 302. 303.</p> <p>Instanced in the Title
of the 7. section. p. 309.
310. & 313.</p> <p>Instanced in the Title
of the 8. Section. p. 318.</p> <p>In pretending to be in-
breasted and inuolued in
our bosome. p. 322.</p> <p>Discovered by exam-
ple of a temperat Turke
p. 325.</p> <p>Instanced pag. 337.
Sect. 9. 341. 343.</p> <p>Instanced in the 2.
Parag. treating of the
Lords supper p. 151. 152</p> <p>Instanced in the 3.
Parag. treating of Tra-
substantiation pa. 360.
362. 363.</p> <p>Instanced in the 4.
Parag. treating of priuie
Masse.</p> |
|---|--|

The Table.

Masse p. 388.

Instanced in the 5. Parag. treating of the Council of Trent p. 405.

Instanced in the same Parag. treating of the 7. Sacraments p. 409. 420.

422. 423.

Instanced in treating of priests mariages pa. 418. 420.

Instanced in the authorities cited for proof of the 5th Parag. p. 427.

Instanced in his endeavouring to prove Communio under both kinds.

p. 455. 457.

Instanced in Service in an unknown tongue, p. 465. 470. & 491.

Instanced in that of Images p. 499. 506. 510.

Instanced in that of Priests ordinatio, p. 586.

Instanced Section 11.

p. 590.

Instanced Section 18. p. 678. & c. per totum.

Dissentions.

Dissentions in matters

of faith amongst the Reformed Churches: instanced in the Supremacie p. 28. 29. Instanced in Puritans rayling against Protestants.

In K. James advise to his son to beware of the.

In M. Mont. discarding them. p. 32.

Instanced in Wickliffe. p. 60.

Instanced in Luther. p. 62.

Instanced in all the Martyrs & Confessors contained in M. Prestons Catalogue, from p. 75. to the end.

Instanced out of the Raylings of Puritans against Eng. Bishops. pa. 123. & 270.

Instanced from the Confession of M. Rogers & others. pa. 276. 277.

E

Elevation.

T He Antiquity of Elevation. p. 50. 51.

F ff

F fa

The Table.

Puritans haue power to lay up their Princes in lincks of Iron. p. 271.	Church of Rome. p. 273.
Deceits.	Instanced in the title of the 4. Section. p. 278.
See examples. p. 186.	Instanced in retorting his owne words vpon him selfe. p. 292.
189. 197.	Instanced in the title of the 6. section p. 298. & p. 301. 303.
Instanced in that ex- ample of Abraham and Lot. p. 208. 209.	Instanced in the Title of the 7. section. p. 299. 310. & 312.
Instanced in the Ana- themas, curses and ex- communications breac- hed out by the Church of Rome against Prote- stants. p. 248.	Instanced of the 8. In p. breac- our D. ple of
Instanced in his speak- ing sometimes well, som- times ill, of the Church of Rome p. 250. 251. &c.	Instanced Sect. 9.
Gathered from the title of the 2. Section. p. 287.	Instanced in the 2. Parag. treating of the Lords supper p. 151. 152.
Instanced in G. Cas- sanders pretended reme- die of Reformation pag. 261. 262.	Instanced in the 3. Parag. treating of Tra- substantiation pa. 360. 362. 363.
Instanced in the pre- tended Corruptions of the	Instanced in the 4. Parag. treating of priuie Masse.

The Table.

Masse p. 388.

Instanced in the 5.

Parag. treating of the
Coñcell of Trent p. 405.

Instanced in the same

Parag. treating of the 7.

Sacramēts p. 409. 420.

422. 423.

Instanced in treating

of priests mariages pa.

418. 420.

Instanced in the au-

thorities cited for proof

the fift Parag. p. 427.

Instanced in his en-

ding to prove Cō-

underboth kinds.

p. 455. 457.

Instanced in Service

unknown tongue,

p. 465. 470. & 491.

Instanced in that of

Images p. 499. 506. 510.

Instanced in that of

Priests ordinatiō, p. 586.

Instanced Section 11.

p. 590.

Instanced Section 18.

p. 678. &c. per totum.

Dissentions.

Dissentions in matters

of faith amongst the Re-

formed Churches: in-

stanced in the Suprema-

cie p. 28. 29. Instanced

in Puritans rayling a-

gainst Protestants.

In K. James advise to

his son to beware of the.

In M. Mont. discar-

ding them. p. 32.

Instanced in Wick-

liffe. p. 60.

Instanced in Luther.

p. 62.

Instanced in all the Mar-

tyrs & Cōfessors contain-

ed in M. Prestons Cata-

logue, frō p. 75. to the ed.

Instanced out of the

Raylings of Puritans a-

gainst Eng. Bishops. pa.

123. & 270.

Instanced from the

Confession of M. Rogers

& others. pa. 276. 277.

E

Elevation.

T He Antiquity of

Elevation. p. 50. 51.

Fff

F Fa-

The Table.

F

Fathers.

Protestants conceipt of
Fathers. p. 597. &c.

Only faith.

Only faith not to In-
stifie. p. 346.

Fasting.

Fasting, or distinction
of meates proued. p. 654.

H

Head.

THe Pope head of
the Church; & she
hauing another head be-
sides Christ, confest by
protestants. p. 685.

See more in Rome.
And in Supremacie.

I

Images.

WOrship of Tom-
bes and pictures,

defended against Sir H.
by S. Austen. p. 305.

The making and wor-
ship of Images defended
by the ancient Fathers.

p. 504. 508.

Sundry miracles proued,
to haue bene wrought by
them. p. 499. 505.

The Obiection of the
Councell of Eliberis a-
gainst Images answered.

p. 505.

The making of pictures
proued by common sence
and reason. p. 511. 518.

How Prot. by denying of
pictures, ar bound neuer
to thinke of Iesus Christ.

p. 514.

Adoratiō at or, before
the proued lawfull. p. 515

The making and wor-
ship of pictures, proued
frō scripture. p. 519. &c.

Sundry miraculous ef-
fects which flowed from
pictures. p. 528.

Sundry arguments to
proue both the making
and worship of Images

lawful.

The Table.

lawfull, p. 531. &c.

Worship of Images, no
Worship of Idols, p. 661.

Worship of Images, pro-
ved from learned Prote-
stants, p. 683.

Indices.

Some expurgatorie Indi-
ces, as well to be found a-
mongst Protestants, as a-
mongst Papists, p. 115. 609.

Indulgence.

Indulgences, p. 540.

Indulgence confessed by
Sir Hum. to haue bene an-
cient, & continued long in
the prim. Church, p. 559.

Item that they are com-
municatorie & impart vi-
to vs the merits of Christ
and his Saints, p. 564.

Of pardons, for hun-
dreds, or thousands of yea-
res, p. 565.

Of pardons applied to the
soules in purgatory. pag.
566. 567.

L

Limbus.

L Imbus Patria proued,
from the testimony of
Protestants, and of Scrip-
tures. p. 566. 567.

M

Masse.

L Vther confess Christ
both to haue instituted
& said Masse. p. 45 & 375.

Witnessed by the Aciene
Fathers. p. 46.

Masse and Consecration,
confessed by the Walden-
ses. p. 90.

Prinat Masse, atearme
Luther tooke from Sa-
thans schoole, p. 280.

The disparitie betwixt
Christs institution, and
the present practise of Pro-
testants instanced, p. 372.

No Masse priuat ibid.

Sundry pregnant rea-
sons ouerthrowing all
Protestants pretensions a-
gainst priuat Masse, p. 375.

376. 379. 380.

The Table.

Examples in the primitive Church of the Receiving of one alone p. 377.

Testimonies of Prot. for prooffe of this point, p. ibid.

Wesphalus tearmeth it, a policie of the diuell to oppose priuat Masse, pag. 378. 379.

The receiving of one alone, Warranted from holy scripture, p. 382.

Prieests Mariage.

Ministers woore first for a sheple, next for a weche, p. 82.

The maintayners of priests mariages against S. Dūstan murdered sodainly by fall of a house. p. 104.

Restraint of Prieests Mariages confest by Prot. to be the generall received doctrine of the Fathers, p. 280.

Mariage not forbidden to any priest as he is a Christian, but as he is a vowed virgin to our Lord, pag. 418. & 655.

Merit.

Merit of good works proued by scripture. p. 649

Miracles.

Miracles wrought by pretended Protestants, p. 124.

Instanced in Iohn of Beverley, by making the signe of the Crosse.

Item by holy water ibid.

Instanced in S. Melitus quenching a fire, p. 126.

Instanced in S. Austen our Apostle, healing a blind man, p. 129.

Blood issued miraculously out of an Image, p. 499.

Another miracle of an Image, recounted by Eusebius, p. 505.

Lawfull Mission.

A Maxime, none may intrude him selfe into a publique charge, without the sending or leaue of a lawfull Superior, p. 147.

In a free and well ordered Citie, one cannot be a Tinkar, without he haue past master of the Trade, p. 148.

Tbii

The Table.

This marke often, yea
infinitely inculcated in the
Word of God, p. 149.

N

New.

P Rotestants proued
New, succeedinge
none, but begining of them
selues, p. 37.

Their Church confess
New, p. 40. 41. 407.
Going out and Chang.

Their Going out from
vs. p. 31. looking back ib.

Their 3. seuerall Chan-
ges since Luther, p. 37.

Their Going out from
vs confessed. It is a marke
of heretiques, p. 665. 666.

Not lawfull vpon any
pretence, p. 240.

Confessing a Going out,
a departure, they are bound
to assigne the time, with
other circumstances, pag.

240. 241.

They ought eiber to
name the precise time of

our falling from the truth,
or of their finding it, else
their going out is a meere
fable, p. 246.

Sir Humfrey proued by
his owne confession to be
out of the Church, pag.

417. 666.

The absurd alleadging
of that of Apoc. 18. 4. for
going out of the Church
of Rome, p. 667.

P

Pardons.

FOR Paydons, see In-
dulgences.

Pilgrimage.

Proued from fauours
imparted by God, more at
one place then at another,

p. 92.

K. Canutus, a preten-
ded Protestant, went on
pilgrimage to Rome, pag.

103.

Purgatorie.

For Purgatorie, see
Limbus.

E f f 3

R Ray

The Table.

R

Raylings.

THeir Raylings and virulent writings against Catholiques, Instanced in Doctor Fulke, against Cardinall Allen, D. Birstow, Doctor Stapleton, and Master Marshall, p. 231.

Instanced in Master Richard Mont. against the Gagge, p. 232.

Reall presence.

Reall presence confessed, Adoration ensueth, p. 51.

Proued from Protestant martyrs, and instanced in Sir Iohn Old castle, p. 78.

The absurditie that ensueth, it being denyed, p. 106.

Confessed expressly by Master Montagu p. 106. 107. By Master Alexander Cooke, p. 606.

Reall presence proued

by an authority brought by Sir Humfrey to disprove it, p. 354. 355.

The disparitie betwixt Christs institution, and the present practise of Protestants, instanced, p. 372.

The Reformed Church

The dispraise of the Reformed Church, from the monthes of Protestants, p. 579.

Church of Rome.

Rome the Mother Church 235. &c. proued by scripture, by reason, and by confession of aduersaries.

Rome the pillar, the Citie, the Spouse, the Rock of the Church &c. p. 241.

Her particular praise by the Fathers, by S. Ambrose, Rufinus, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Lucius, Rupertus, pag. 242. 243. With many others.

The Church of Rome confessed by Sir Humfrey to be of the familie of Iesus, pag. 250.

Confest

The Table.

Confest by him to be
the head Church of all o-
ther, p. 263. 264.

Her secretes pretended
Apostacies Refuted, pag.
302. 303.

Ours confest the true
Church, by their being al-
wayes inbreasted in our
bosome, p. 330.

The praises of the
Church of Rome from the
mouthes of Protestants,
p. 579. &c.

Certaine saluation in
the Church of Rome, pro-
ued from Sir Hum. him-
selfe, p. 595.

S

Sacraments.

Wickliffe acknow-
ledges five Sa-
craments, p. 87.

The Waldenses four,
p. 90.

Both primitive Fathers,
and late Protestants con-
fesse the number of more

Sacraments then Prote-
stants doe, p. 411.

No Scripture assureth
the number ether of two,
or seauen Sacraments, p.
412. 413.

The five Sacraments de-
nyed by Protestanes, pro-
ued to be proper Sacra-
ments, p. 413. &c.

The 7. Sacraments pro-
ued out of the same Au-
thors Sir Humfrey brin-
ges to improue them, p.
420. 421.

More then two proper
Sacraments proued out of
S. Austen, p. 424.

More Sacraments then
two, by confession both of
the ancient Farbers, and
reformed Protestants,
pa. 632.

Inuocation of Saints.

Proued from Protestant
Martyrs. Instance in Wil-
liam Taylor, burned in
Smithfield; p. 75.

Instanced in K. Canu-
tus a pretended Protestant
p. 103.

The Table.

Proued from the testi-
monies of Saint Austen,
pag. 600.

Sir Humfrey supposeth
many glorious Saints, re-
puted for such by the
Whole Church, to be dam-
ned, p. 669. &c.

Prayer to Saints, pro-
ued from learned Prote-
stants, p. 684.

Satisfactions.

Merits of Saints and
Satisfactions, proued from
Protestants, p. 680.

Scripture.

A Question disputed,
betwixt vs & Protestants
by Scripture only, with
conference of places; in-
stanced in holy oyle. p. 15.

Scripture cannot de-
cide all controuersies, par-
ticularly this of produ-
cing visible professors in
all Ages: the promise
whereof is originally fetcht
from scripture: the per-
formance is a matter of
fact. p. 147.

Scripture not the sole

Rule of faith, p. 264.

Their owne scriptures
confest by themselves to be
corrupted, p. 281.

More scriptures Cando-
nicall, then those appro-
ued by our present Prote-
stants, p. 686.

Seruite in vnknown
tongue.

Instanced in many Na-
tions, p. 44.

Seruite in an vnknow-
en tongue, contaynes in-
struction, although the
wordes be not vnderstood,
p. 468.

Sundry proofes from holy
scripture for our Catho-
lique practise, p. 475. &c.

Proofes from the au-
thorities of the Fathers,
and first from S. Austen,
pag. 478.

From Origen, p. 481.

Proofes from Reason,
pag. 482.

Succession.

For succession from S.
Peters see, p. 52. 53.

The absurditie en-
suing

The Table.

fining the dentall of succession, p. 54. 55. 56.

The glorious titles of succession, p. 55.

It is the golden chaine of the Church, p. 57.

Protestants can no more deny our succession to be the same, then the same sun that shines now, & that a 1000. yeares since to be the same, p. 57. 58.

The trial by the search of succeeding visible Pastors, the complement of many other obscure questions, and more sensibly to be discerned by the simple, then many other particular controversies.

pag. 146.

The Ancient Fathers confounded al hereticks by this Argument, pag.

148. 149.

Succession, the principall externe motive to Christianitie, p. 150.

The principall erring of Protestants, for that

they seeke to know what they should belecue, before who to belecue. ibi.

What Protestants were to do, if they were to be put out of all by an upstart heresie, as we are: to wit, still to urge those upstarts, for their Mission & succession p. 151.

As the Euangelist S. Mat. shews Christs corporall generation from Abraham to Christ, so ought Protestants to shew the interrupted descent of their Ecclesiasticall succession, p. 152.

A model how succession of doctrine, ought to be deduced by Protestants, p. 351.

The same exacted in the pedigree of their Protestant pretended Bishops. succeeding in their principall See, p. 493.

Supremacy.

Confest by Protestants, pag. 43.

Pope, confest head in earth

The Table

earth by Wickliffe p. 60.

His voice confest
for the voice of Christ,
pag. 61.

Six strong reasons
brought by Luther, to
proue the supremacy,
pag. 62.

Confirmed by the te-
stimonie of Austen, pag.
601. &c.

T

Traditions.

Diuers Traditions
in the Protestants
Church, not to be found
in holy scripture, p. 663.

Transubstantiation.

Protestants confes the
ancient Fathers to haue
taught Transubstantia-
tion, p. 39. 47.

An authoritie of El-
fricks brought by Sir
Hum. against the Real
presence, plainly proueth
Transubstan. p. 354.

Further confirmed
by two miracles, p. 356.

pag. 474.

Confirmed by autho-
rity of Fathers, pa. 365.

Tergiuersation.

Sir Hum. first Tergi-
uersation from the state
of the question, p. 186.

His 2. instanced,
pag. 189.

His 3. instanced, p.
195. pag. 304.

His 4. instanced,
pag. 337.

His 5. instanced,
pag. 464.

V

Vnity.

THe Church but
one, and therefore
can not be inbreasted in
our bosome, p. 400.

Vowes.

Lawfull Vowes made
to God, bind to perfor-
mance, p. 419.

Vntruths.

A hundred severall
Vntruths laid to Sir
Ham. charge. Per totū.

The

The Errata.

P Ag. 12. line 1. for lurg, read , lurch, line 12.
 next, text, pag. 23. line 27. for 1930. 1630. pag.
 46. line 5. after the word, purpose, adde, S. Ignatius
 Martyr. Pag. 71. line 3. truth, deceit. Pag. 135.
 line 15. who, that. Pag. 202. line 7. pag. &c. pag.
 171. pag. 211. line 2. adde, *by their owne confessions.*
 Pag. 213. line 12, ad the word *downe*. Pag. 241.
 line 12. *thirdly, fourthly*. Pag. 257. line 4. *vible, vi-*
sible. Pag. 291. line 19. Is the booke, Is this the
 booke. Pag. 308. line 20. put *Husse*, before *Luther*.
 Pag. 310. line 20, tells thus, tells vs thus. Pag. 334.
 line 20. *of that*, of the same. Pag. 366. line 23. *Tran-*
substantiation, Transubstantialitie. Pag. 428. line
 16. after the word, Fathers, adde, in the Affirma-
 tive. Pag. 439. line 10. two yeares, two hundred
 yeares. Pag. 486. line 13. could, would; Presse vs Sir
Humfrey, adde, with. Pag. 656. line 6. I say 23.
 I say 28. Pag. 659. line 22. confound, confoun-
 ded. Pag. 717. line 25. such Catalogue, such a Ca-
 talogue.

APPRO-

APPROBATIO.

Librum cui titulus est, *Via verè Tuta . The Truly Safe Way, discovering the danger, crookednesse and uncertainty of Sir Humfrey Lyndes Unsafe way*, à Domino Ioanne Heignam compositum, diligenter legi, & non solum fidei Catholicæ, Apostolicæ, Romanæ, nec non doctrinæ scholasticę per omnia consonum inueni, sed & benè & solide elaboratum, & propterea dignum vt in publicam Anglorum vtilitatem prodeat . Datum Duaci 20. Octobris 1630.

F. Rudesindus Barlo
S. Theologia Doctor
& Professor.

APPROBATIO.

Reverendissimus Dominus PETRUS PAVNETIVS Episcopus Audomarensis, permittit hunc libum Typis demandari. Datum Audomari in Palatio Episcopali, Trigesima Octobris, Anni Incarnationis Dominicæ, Millesimi Sexentesimi Trigesimi.

LIBERTVS GALER
Secret.



